#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 492

EA 002 885

AUTHOR TITLE Melton, George E.: And Others.

The Principalship: Job Specifications and Salary

Considerations for the 70's"

INSTITUTION

National Association of Secondary School Principals,

Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE

NOTE 70p.

AVAILABLE FROM

National Association of Secondary School Principals,

1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

(\$2.00, Quantity discounts)

EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS

EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Administrator Background, \*Administrator Evaluation.

Administrator Responsibility, Administrator Role,

\*Contract Salaries, Evaluation Techniques,

Leadership, Leadership Qualities, \*Occupational Information, Performance Criteria, \*Principals,

Salary Differentials, School Environment, \*Secondary

Schools

70

#### **ABSTRACT**

This document has three parts: (1) an updated job description of the secondary school principalship, (2) a modern approach to an evaluation of the principal's performance, and (3) a statement of how to determine salaries for principals. The text stresses that the principal must perform a variety of roles: educational leader; administrator; communicator between students, staff, community, other schools, board of education, and colleagues: conflict mediator; educator of educators; ombudsman; and professional. It is emphasized that the performance of a principal must be evaluated on the basis of all the roles he performs, and that objective evaluation instruments such as graphs and checklists fail to evaluate the entire responsibility. Results of a national survey on administrative salaries, arranged alphabetically by school district, are appended. Data are categorized according to (1) relationship between supervisory/administrative and teacher schedules, and (2) considerations and factors taken into account in setting supervisory/administrative salaries. (DE)

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

# THE PRINCIPALSHIP

Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the 70's

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EOUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright 1970
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

Two dollars per copy. Twenty percent discount for 10 or more copies. Special rates for 25 or more copies available upon request. Payment must accompany orders of five dollars or less.



# **Foreword**

American educational institutions are experiencing phenomenal change, and the secondary school principalship is no exception. It is predictable that this rate of change will accelerate over the next decade. Herein lies a challenge, for if the principal's status and remuneration are to be commensurate with his ever-more-demanding tasks, updated criteria will be needed to insure that his modern role will be more precisely defined and that his salary will provide more adequate compensation for his labor.

Recognizing that it is imperative that the NASSP contribute to the establishment of these criteria, the Association's Status and Welfare Committee recommended that the Association prepare a new statement on principals' salaries. This statement would be supported by a new job description and suggestions concerning how to evaluate the principal's performance. Accordingly, the Association brought together a study-group composed of six educators who, together, represent a wide variety of secondary school interests and experience. The group was divided into three teams; each team collaborated on one of the major sections of this booklet.

The major contributors to Part A of the section on salary determination were Harry J. Hartley and James J. Richards of New York University. Part B of that section was submitted by McManis Associates, a leading management consultant firm that recently completed a study of NASSP's operations. We are grateful to all of them for their contributions.

It is obvious that this publication's recommendations cannot be considered in any way binding on any school system. The NASSP, however, will be very pleased if this statement exerts a persuasive influence not only on professional educators but also on the public, upon whose understanding and support the future of the principalship and our system of education ultimately rests.

Owen B. Kiernan Executive Secretary



# Authors

# I. Job Specifications for Principals (1)

GEORGE E. MELTON, Principal Woodbury Junior High School Shaker Heights, Ohio JOHN STANAVAGE, Executive Secretary
Commission on Secondary Schools
North Central Association of Colleges
and Secondary Schools
Chicago, Illinois

# II. Evaluating the Principal (11)

JULIUS C. BERNSTEIN
Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Livingston, New Jersey

WILLARD SAWYER, Principal Kennedy High School Fremont, California

# III. Salary Determination for Principals (19)

#### A

EDWARD B. BYHRE, Principal
Hubert Olson Junior High School
Bloomington, Minnesota

HARRY J. HARTLEY, Head
Division of Educational Administration
New York University
New York, New York

WILLIAM KOLOFF, Vice President
Organization of School Administrators
and Supervisors
Detroit, Michigan

JAMES J. RICHARDS, Assistant Professor New York University New York, New York

B

GERALD L. McManis, Senior Partner
McManis Associates
Washington, D.C.

Project Director—CHARLES R. HILSTON, Director of Field Services
National Association of Secondary School Principals
Washington, D. C.



# I. Job Specifications for Principals

NEW societal forces are changing the roles that the principal traditionally has played and are making obsolete many of the grounds rules within which he traditionally has operated. In certain respects, this makes his job more difficult, but, at the same time, it is clear that new opportunities for growth and leadership are being presented. In short, the way is open for an altered, vigorous principalship to emerge, a principalship that will differ markedly from its predecessor.

During this transitional period, it is more important than ever before that the principal retain his authority within his school, as he is in the best position to keep the school stable in the face of possible disruptions and to make sure that any changes made are orderly and reasoned.

But if the principal is not to forfeit his claim to that position of educational leadership to which he rightfully aspires, he must be eager to take the lead in channeling the forces of change so that they benefit his school and its learning process. He must at the same time take steps to insure that he has a major hand in the necessary reappraisals and restructuring of his profession. If he surrenders this task to others, he may rapidly lose his importance.

This reappraisal and restructuring presupposes that the principal has a sure grasp of what his role ought to be. It is the intent of this chapter, then, to provide some guidelines to help him define his place in our contemporary educational community.

One point should be made clear, however: Any description of the scope of the secondary school principalship as it exists today —or even tomorrow—must be tentative, always subject to change as conditions themselves alter. The principalship of the 80's, for example, may bear little resemblance to the portrait of the principalship sketched here.

In addition, as we consider the varied components of the secondary school principalship, it becomes obvious that the



attention of the principal will be pulled in many directions, and that no one person could hope to achieve all these tasks with equal effectiveness.

The principal and his administrative team will be confronted with an endless succession of priority-choices, and the priorities will shift as circumstances dictate. Some tasks will now be of pressing urgency, clamoring for the principal's close consideration; others will be eclipsed by more insistent problems and demands. The decision as to which to stress and which to subordinate reflects the administrative acumen of the principal, a quality fundamental to his worth to the school.

Hence, no attempt has been made in his chapter to place the principal's many roles in any special order of precedence. Priority decisions must be made locally by the principal and his administrative staff.

With these caveats, we shall examine the varied hats that the principal must wear.

#### An Educational Leader\*

The principal is an *educational* administrator, with all that the term implies. His major responsibility should be—in cooperation with his staff—to direct, guide, and coordinate the total educational program within the school.

His cardinal function is the *improvement of instruction*, which will enhance the learning experiences of his students. The principal, then, is first and foremost an instructional leader: All his other activities must directly support this central function, or else he jeopardizes his raison d'etre.

This instructional responsibility means stressing the effectiveness of the school's teaching-learning process rather than simply increasing the efficiency of its administration. As educational leader, the principal—

 keeps instruction and learning foremost in his own planning, making certain that they are central to all school deliberations.

<sup>\*</sup>Several of the descriptive category titles were taken from NASCP's own service brochure published in 1969.

- adapts the school's program and procedures to the requirements of the individual student. He is also sensitive to the needs of the individual teacher and he sees that human values are not slighted for institutional convenience.
- helps to establish and clarify both short and long range goals for his school, and makes sure that they are both educationally sound and administratively feasible.
- encourages his staff to suggest new ideas and to try new ways of doing things. He, therefore, acts as a catalyst for innovative thinking and action on the part of others in the school.
- does not hesitate to suggest his own ideas for program, curriculum, and organization.
- accepts accountability for the over-all effectiveness of the school. He touches both edges of the sword of leadership: authority and responsibility.
- fosters sound interpersonal relationships among the students, the teachers, and the administration.

As an educational leader, the principal must also be a skillful supervisor of instruction. Supervision, however, is a far more complex function than the simple observation of teachers. It entails organizing and developing the teaching staff into a coherent unit committed to creating the best possible situation for the students. Among the many aspects of this supervisory role are the following:

- building a competent, balanced, professionally-alert staff through sound selection, thorough orientation, and continuing in-service activities
- supervising individual teachers to assist them in their selfimprovement efforts
- evaluating teacher performance on the basis of cooperatively-determined objectives and criteria
- nurturing potential staff leadership by providing opportunities for professional growth.



#### An Administrator

The secondary school, like any other corporate endeavor, requires conscious and constant administration. No school can realize its purposes without someone assuming the responsibility of helping the many persons involved clarify objectives, identify problems, establish priorities, develop strategies, and assess progress. Moreover, if utter chaos is to be avoided, someone must integrate into a meaningful whole the discrete, disparate efforts of those who, taken together, constitute the school. It is, of course, the principal who is charged with this vital leadership role.

Obviously, the principal must possess the requisite authority to execute the mandates of his office. He must be more than a pro tem chairman of a debating society. And yet, in the democratic climate prevailing in our American schools, this authority will be more derived than attributed, more a matter of professional respect earned than position status granted. In addition, the principal must share decision-making at various levels of involvement with teachers, students, parents, and community groups. This sharing ought not to impair his own authority; it should, rather, make it stronger, more resilient, more effective than ever before.

As an administrator, the principal will—

• direct policy-making at the building level; and participate in the decision-making at all other levels when the policies in question affect his school's operation.

 implement policy, accepting the responsibility, while sharing the authority in whatever manner he considers to be in the best interests of the school.

modify policy, when he judges it desirable to do so. When
he does not possess the authority to permit the modification, he recommends the changes to those who do.

 broaden the base of his decision-making, involving students, teachers, parents, and citizens whenever appropriate.

Although the principalship may be thought of as a single function, it will, as noted above, be carried out by a number of people: the administrative staff and the faculty.

In developing his administrative staff, the principal will face a number of difficult questions: Under what circumstances can authority be delegated? When can responsibility be shared? How can tasks be efficiently subdivided?

In answering these and other questions, the principal, who is the administrator of an educational institution, will operate under constraints and circumstances different from those that shape the role of, say, an industrial manager. For one thing, the principal works within a community of teachers, staff assistants, and students. His effectiveness hinges upon the respect of those with whom, not through whom, he must work. The principal must learn how to help his colleagues grow—and how to grow with them.

It is useful, then, to think of the principal, at least in part, as a strategist, managing the human resources available to the school to accomplish the school's stated purposes. Again, however, this management role cannot be totally equated with similarly designated posts in industry. Unlike industrial managers, educators always seek the best product, even if it is more costly, i.e., less efficient administratively. As an example, regarding the principal for a moment as a manager of teachers, his sole intent should be to help them attain increasingly higher levels of instructional effectiveness; they ought not to be managed for ends alien to their own professional concerns.

The key concept in this emerging principalship is accountability. The principal must be held responsible for the impact the school has on the students coming to its door, whether that impact be positive or negative. He must help to establish the job-targets for the school; and once these are established, he must not evade the responsibility for the success or failure of the school in reaching these goals. Ideally, all the professionals involved in the school—teachers, central office personnel, and principal alike—should share that accountability, but in his role of educational leader, the principal bears a unique responsibility, a responsibility that cannot be delegated.

### An Interpreter

The principal is a communicator, explaining the school's goals, procedures, and objectives to everyone concerned. As an interpreter, he presents the school, its program, its purposes, its philosophy, its problems, to:

• the students, so that they may understand and appreciate

the conditions under which they learn

• the staff, professional and non-professional alike, to provide them with that overview of the school so difficult to obtain in the relative isolation of the conventional classroom or school building

 the community, with all its varied publics, so that the school becomes meaningful to them in terms of its social purposes

• the other schools in the district, so that the educational process of the district is unified and articulated

 the central office and the board of education, so that the higher echelons understand what the school's needs are and what it is trying to accomplish

 his colleagues in the principalship, so his school will share in the new developments in American education and bene-

fit from the experience of others.

This communication must be two-way. Not only must the principal interpret the school to the community: he must also interpret the community to the school. This sort of interaction applies to all of the above target groups.

### A Conflict Mediator

Conflict occurs in all organizations. This is doubtless beneficial, since conflict gives institutions much of their vitality. Hence, the duty of the principal is not to eliminate conflict within the school but rather mediate it when it does arise, so that it does not weaken the unity of the school or threaten the achievement of its goals.

Thus, as conflict mediator, the principal—

 recognizes his responsibility for establishing a climate in the school that will make disruptive conflict unnecessary (though admittedly never impossible). The school should



be able to permit strong differences of opinion to exist without their disrupting its tenor.

- is realistic enough to realize that conflict will arise as people differ sharply and passionately on means and ends.
- recognizes in the ingredients of a conflict those opportunities that may exist for promoting personal and professional growth.

The principal must learn not only how to live within the terms of the negotiated contract but also how to direct the terms of that contract towards the enhancement of teaching and learning within the school. He must do more than simply carry out the stipulations of the contract; he needs to help both the board and the teachers understand the potential for better schools that is implicit in the very process of negotiation. He must, therefore, have an active part in the negotiations.

### An Educator of Educators

The principal is a specialist in secondary education. He also realizes that secondary education is a distinct field which, while supportive of and supported by the elementary and higher education levels, makes its own unique contribution. He, therefore, provides information and direction to students, staff, parents, central office, superintendent, and board of education, keeping them all alert to the developments and trends in the field.

Furthermore, the principal, while deferring to the expertness of teachers in their individual subject fields and specific scholarship, understands the elements of good teaching and shares his insight with the teachers. He is a resource person who can help the individual teacher appraise and improve his own teaching effectiveness. And being acquainted with the principles and practices of high quality secondary education, the principal knows the balance, the sequence, and the degree of freedom that are desirable for an innovative curriculum. This might well be his major contribution to his school's curriculum development.



#### An Ombudsman

The principal must be able to step back from time to time and objectively and impartially criticize his own efforts. This is especially true when a person appears before him seeking relief or redress from some school action.

In these instances, the principal will be required to serve as the advocate for people who are questioning the very school structure or policies he has helped to create and which he administers. He must function as an ombudsman, so that the school does not end up sacrificing an individual to the requirements of the institution. He must stand as a bulwark against that insidious depersonalization that so quickly can blight the nobler purposes of the school.

This ombudsman role is increasingly being demanded of the principal, as those in our secondary schools desperately struggle to keep the schools from losing their human dimension. It is a role that demands an open-door policy on the part of the principal, inimical as that policy may be to the performance of his other pressing responsibilities. It may prove to be the one function the principal will never be able to delegate. If so, the perspectives of the principal will have to alter dramatically in the years ahead.

As ombudsman, the principal will—

- provide counsel and assistance for all youth, dissident as well as cooperative.
- open his door to all teachers, militant as well as passive, non-conformist as well as agreeable.
- work sympathetically with all parents, aggressive as well as bewildered.
- challenge his own school, when it proves to be restrictive of individual growth and aspiration.

### A Professional

The principal is more than the head of the local school. He began as and continues to be a professional teacher among teachers, and a professional among his principal colleagues

across the nation. It is incumbent upon him to contribute to his profession, as well as to derive benefit from it. If he remains wrapped in parochial isolation, both his effectiveness and the effectiveness of his school will be lessened.

Because of this, the principal has an obligation to maintain his professional growth by continuing university level work; by attending conventions, workshops, and seminars; by keeping abreast, as well as he can, of the literature in secondary education; and by contributing to that literature himself. Indeed, every district should encourage or perhaps even require all its secondary principals to attend as many professional events within and outside the immediate district as is feasible. The requirement should be made practical by a personal professional growth fund for the principal of no less that four percent of his salary.

As a professional, the principal-

- participates in continuous study and research in secondary education and administration.
- regularly attends the conventions and annual meetings of his professional associations.
- contributes to the programs of and seeks leadership positions in those associations.
- contributes to the secondary principalship by means of articles and speeches.
- shares with his fellow principals his knowledge, his understanding, and his comfort when the occasion requires.

Moreover, as the number of assistant principals increases within the school, there will be a strong tendency for each to undertake specialized functions, confining his particular efforts to clearly delimited areas. This division of administrative tasks has much to recommend it, since it enables quick and incisive expertness to be applied to specific problems. But it also denies the various assistant principals a fuller apprenticeship in administration, and may, therefore, limit their professional growth.



It is important, therefore, that the principal organize his administrative corps so that each assistant principal is a generalist. In this way, once fully prepared, he can move promptly into a principalship of his own. The principal must afford his assistants that depth and breadth of administrative experiences that will permit them ultimately to measure themselves against the demands of the principalship itself and to undertake the position with a high degree of confidence.

### Summary

When one ponders the extensive responsibilities of the secondary school principal, it becomes apparent that the task may well be beyond the physical capacity of any one person. In this chapter, we have in reality been describing the *principalship*, a position that comprises a complex of functions, all of which are overseen by one man or woman, who is given the appropriate authority and who stands accountable for what is achieved.

In view of the scope of the role we have just outlined, we feel impelled to add one more point. The principal is not a machine, an automaton programmed for 24-hour duty by the board of education and the community. He is a very human being, with social and family commitments, with limits to his energy and creativity, and with the usual need for rest and relaxation. We urge superintendents and board members to remember this when they and the principal sit down to decide on the school's goals and its staffing.

The contents of this chapter should be kept in mind when reading what follows, which is a discussion of the principal's formal evaluation.



## II. Evaluating the Principal

HE contemporary principal's success should be measured by how well he performs the activities and discharges the responsibilities described in the previous chapter. The problem is that, traditionally, this measurement has been made by means of objective evaluation instruments such as graphs, checklists, temperature charts, and other devices, all too many of which are inadequate in that their criteria (1) are too general and impersonal, (2) tend to include too much that is mundane, and (3) often confuse means with ends.

In addition, the principal, when he is measured by these standards, is generally regarded solely as an administrator by objective, i.e., he is evaluated according to the degree to which he satisfies pre-determined task-performance criteria. It is not our intent to suggest that administration by objective is necessarily a secondary goal. Very often, however, the principal's true effectiveness depends on how well he administers by exception; i.e., how he anticipates, identifies, and copes with the myriad of intangible but critical factors that influence the achievement of successful job-targets.

It is time for some definitions. A "task," as we use the term, is some concrete duty that the principal must perform as part of his ordinary, day-to-day routine. Granted: The successful completion of "tasks" is absolutely vital to the school's stability and progress. But "tasks" tend to be far more demanding of time than of imagination. They are all too often rote and repetitive. They may not be closely related to the larger issues of education; indeed, they might impede the principal as he tries to address these issues. "Tasks" are the sort of duties that may lead a principal to reflect at the end of the day: "I worked like a galley slave all day and accomplished nothing."

A "job-target," on the other hand, is an objective that relates to the long-range issues of school improvement. "Job-targets" are likely to have significant impact on such areas as curriculum or community relations. As such, they require the principal to



use all his powers of imagination and all his administrative skills. "Job-targets," then, are goals that are worthy of being the core concerns of the modern principal.

We contend that the principal ought to be evaluated by how well his job-targets are accomplished, not only by how well his tasks are done.

Moreover, we believe that his response to the unpredictable problems and intangible factors that arise in the course of administering his school must be an integral part of such evaluation.

What do we mean by "unpredictable problems" and "intangible factors?" Here are a few that might develop in the course of a school year: student behavior that does not conform to the behavior that is traditional to the school; varying teacher effectiveness in implementing curricula, particularly new curricula; community tension that expresses itself in attacks on the school; budgeted funds that are not appropriated; teacher contract difficulties that provoke either staff apathy or aggressiveness, perhaps reaching the extreme of a work stoppage; and just plain human frailty or cussedness.

We believe that, when the principal's performance is judged, it is imperative that the greater weight be placed on his success as an administrator by exception. It is in this role that he displays his flexibility, his humanity, his ingenuity and innovative spirit, his courage, and his concern for those problems of the school and the community that are not foreseen nor provided for in the rather broad purposes of an objective, evaluative instrument.

We concede that from the employer's point of view, evaluation is easier when it is applied only to the principal's more tangible, objectively-measurable responsibilities. However, we stress again the salient importance of subjective considerations, and the performance of responsibilities that require the mastery of a combination of skills and the ability to function well in a complex and fast-changing situation.

Stated simply, the modern principal must be evaluated in terms of how well he organizes the resources at his command, first to define and then to achieve truly important job-targets.

His ability to coordinate the talents and opinions of the many people—and institutions—with which he must deal will be the key to his success. Consider what is involved in the five-step process of administering a job-target. (It should be added that the phrase "what is involved" ought quite properly to refer not only to the problems of coordinating the efforts and knowledge of others, but also to the demands made on the principal's own personal storehouse of knowledge.)

## Step One: Identifying the full range of possible targets

To find out what is necessary or desirable for his school program, the principal must use all the available data-finding devices: surveys, tests, reports, questionnaires, and opinionnaires. Also, he must closely observe what is happening around him and take the time to reflect on what he has seen. And, in addition, he must interview and consult with his faculty, his administrative staff, and as many students as possible; these consultations may be the most important method of all, as it is the people in the school who have the clearest idea of "where it's at."

# Step Two: Settling on achievable targets

Not everything that people in the school think ought to be done, however, can or should be done. Once the principal has a thorough overview of the many things considered desirable by his staff, faculty, and students, it is up to him and his supervisor to decide which of these constitute acceptable and achievable job-targets.

The decision should be based on a number of factors. First, targets must be capable of being delimited and made precise so as to afford the principal and his staff a reasonable chance to define them, establish evaluative criteria, and achieve some results. To be sure, targets ought to call into play the full range of the principal's skills, but no target should be so broadly defined that it amounts to a virtual restatement of the principal's schoolwide responsibility, and is, thus, for all practical purposes, impossible to measure.



For example, a problem such as "Improvement of Communication" encompasses so much that it would defy any attempt either to establish a clear approach to its solution or to construct any method to measure results. Since this problem of communication occurs throughout the school, what would the principal concentrate on? Students communicating with teachers? With other students? Faculty communicating with administrators? Intra-faculty communication? Staff communicating with the community? The principal himself communicating with any or all of these?

The lesson, we trust, is clear: The job-targets must be within reach.

A second criterion for targets is that they must be capable of completion and evaluation in a fixed period of time, or perhaps in a series of fixed time-periods.

Finally, there are a host of other factors that might have some bearing on the final decisions. These are considerations of money, personnel, community sensitivities, and the like. The principal, with his intimate knowledge of his own school and the community that surrounds it, will surely be able to weed out many of the suggestions as being neither necessary nor feasible. And his supervisor, who will almost assuredly be either the school superintendent or someone from the superintendent's office, will employ his broader view of the district's problems to reject or modify others.

## Step Three: Establishing performance criteria

Performance criteria must be written with great care, as they will form the basis of the supervisor's eventual evaluation of the principal. The criteria should state what will be considered a minimally acceptable performance. In addition, they should define what the principal and his supervisor consider to be optimum objectives, i.e., the best results that can reasonably be hoped for.

Step Four: Getting the job done

The targets have been set and the performance criteria have



been established. Now comes the hard part—actually reaching the goals.

It is this step in the process that requires the principal to bring into play all the many talents that he possesses. He must have insight into all the singular skills and aptitudes of the individuals on his faculty and staff and be able to detect who might contribute what to any given project. He must be an educational leader, explaining to each contributor just what is expected of him and how it relates to the big picture; to do this, of course, he must have a clear view of the big picture himself. He will be obliged to put on his diplomat's hat, to coordinate all the variegated efforts of his personnel and to mediate and resolve the inevitable conflicts. As ombudsman, he must listen to complaints and take action to redress grievances and remove roadlocks. In short, he must be the complete leader, ready to steady the uncertain, prod the lethargic, and commend the worthy.

It is during this phase that we see the principal acting in his role of administrator by exception. He will start off with a coherent plan and a nice, neat time-schedule. But the realities of life have a way of reducing these to shambles. We have mentioned in an earlier passage what form these realities are likely to take; let it suffice here to restress that the principal's professionalism will meet its most severe test in coping with these sudden crises and how he meets this test ought to be an important factor in his evaluation.

If the target assignment is composed of distinct stages, it would benefit the principal to pause at the end of each stage and conduct an evaluation of how things have developed and what the prospects are for the next stage's success.

### Step Five: The final evaluation

The final evaluation is done by the principal and his supervisor. This process ought to be initiated by the principal, the first step being his evaluation of his own performance. The two administrators will measure the achievement of the jobtargets assigned to the principal, always bearing in mind the



restrictions and constraints that might have been placed upon him by the variables discussed above.

To conclude the evaluation process, the principal might report in full on the results of his evaluation to those who worked with him, so that all may share in the lessons learned from

the experience.

We call the reader's attention to the total lack of any mechanical or graphic charts, such as checklists, in our evaluative schema. We repeat our belief that such devices have little purpose, oriented as they are to personal characteristics or to means, often unrelated to accomplishments of ends. We emphasize once more that the only evaluation appropriate for the modern principal is that which rates him in terms of how well—or how poorly—he achieved specific objectives, and what qualities of leadership he revealed while administering his projects.

Through this article, we have been discussing "job-targets." What might some of these job-targets be? We must state at the outset that the individual characteristics of each school district and community will greatly affect the identification of all job-targets. But even in the face of this, we believe that some samples of job-targets may be valuable to the readers, and so here are ten of them:\*

1. Extension of meaningful curricular activities for terminal students in a school that is heavily college-prep.

2. Development of a program of independent study in all subject areas.

3. Establishment of interdisciplinary curricula in mathphysics or in shorthand-English (everybody knows about English-history or the humanities).

4. Modifying student attitudes and behavior in order to reduce vandalism, theft, mischief, fighting, cheating, or any selected combination of aberrant behavior.

<sup>\*</sup> Several of these targets are derived or quoted from the material on appraisal developed in the Cincinnati Public Schools.

- 5. Stimulating staff alertness and reaction to current research, and thinking in particular approaches to subject fields.
- 6. Reorganizing staff meetings—departmental and general.
- 7. Revising a student handbook, a teacher's manual, or a body of written school policies.
- 8. Developing a more systematic and effective pattern for parental conferences with teachers or counselors.
- 9. Setting up study committees for review of current instructional and resource materials in social studies or industrial arts (as examples).
- 10. Extension of teacher understanding and use of visual materials with emphasis on the overhead projector and the opaque projector.

We shall conclude our discussion of the principal's evaluation with an example: the job-target plan of a principal in a large high school in the West.

#### JOB-TARGET

To reduce daily student absence from ten percent to six percent within the time limit of the fall semester.

#### Plan and Process

- Assign the management of the program's day-to-day details to the vice principal.
- Place one-third of an assistant principal's time at the disposal of the vice principal to be used in the resolution of the problem.
- Initiate case conferences composed of teachers, counselors, special service personnel, and administrators to assess the causes for student non-attendance and to initiate a plan of action for individual students having attendance problems.
- Identify categories and cases of high incidence of absence.
- Develop a systematic daily contact with parents of absentees to determine causes for an absence. (These contacts are to be made by telephone or home visitations.)



- Use the school nurse and psychologist in a working partnership with students and parents when a health or emotional problem appears to be a primary cause for absenteeism.
- Initiate teacher-student conferences to determine the need for individualizing a student's learning experiences.
- Initiate truancy hearings for students and their parents when there is evidence of poor home support for regular school attendance.
- Establish a schedule of monthly meetings with the principal for progress reports. The vice principal and his staff will provide statistical data on daily attendance, student-parent contacts, teacher-student contacts, truancy hearing reports, and case conference reports.
- Assess the data presented at the monthly meeting and formulate further plans and processes, with necessary modifications, based on the assessment of needs.
- Conduct a final evaluation of the target data with the staff, with appropriate conclusions on basis of success or failure.



# III. Salary Determination for Principals

### A

**L**T the present time, little uniformity exists in the approaches used to determine the annual salaries for secondary school principals in the nation's approximately 18,000 operating school districts. Principals in some districts have developed elaborate, detailed salary indexes, whereas principals in other districts prefer to negotiate their compensation on an individual basis with the board of education. There is, however, a discernible national trend towards use of some form of collective negotiations procedures by secondary school principals. In a few cases, the formal demands made by bargaining agents of principals reflect a militancy similar to that so often attributed to teachers' groups. Usually, a highly professional, non-militant approach is used. Principals are actively involved in attempts to improve their position within the overall compensation system of education, which includes consideration of salaries, benefits, and professional working conditions.

The general purpose of this section is to explore current and future approaches to salary determination for principals. More specifically, the objectives are three-fold:

- to establish criteria for designing fixed index ratios for salaries
- 2. to analyze five alternative ways of determining salary schedules
- to recommend methods of improving salary determination.

# Criteria for Designing Salary Structures and Fixed Index Ratios

Equity to administrators and accountability to board and community demand that salary determination possess a rationale, a consistency, and a reasonable predictability. None of these is possible unless criteria are identified and applied uniformly.

ERIC

The responsibilities of the principalship have already been delineated in Section I. On the basis of the discussion in Section II, it is suggested that the use of job titles as a guide to salary differentiation should be discarded as inconsistent and inequitable for describing responsibilities and duties. This suggestion is made because the size of a school system substantially modifies the job content and its status in relation to other positions. For example, an assistant superintendent for business affairs in a small district might perform duties that in a larger district would be distributed among Directors of Budget, of Transportation, of Cafeteria, of Buildings and Grounds Maintenance, of Purchasing, of Research and Planning, and so on. Any classification according to job titles assumes that a given set of responsibilities and duties are easily implied and typical of school systems everywhere. This simply is not true. Yet how many districts base administrative salaries on just such a hierarchy of job titles a hierarchy that assumes a gradation of responsibilities and duties without job descriptions backed by evidence derived from observation. Such a description would answer the question: What does a person in such a position actually do?

This "job title" practice leads to problems. For example, an assistant principal of a large school may be performing at a greater level of responsibility and undertaking more tasks than

the principal of a very small school.

The authors question this "job title" approach, advocating instead a procedure that requires a job analysis and observation of the required task-performance of each position within the system. The results of this process would determine the salary structure. The proposed job analysis and observation would be guided by the criteria in Table 1. (See following page.)

The criteria require a careful analysis of the person (requirements and qualifications), the responsibilities assigned, the tasks actually performed, and the conditions under which they must be performed. This approach to salary determination may, in fact, result in a hierarchy of salaries quite different from the hierarchy of status positions identified by job titles. With the "job title" method, salaries correspond to prestige and status; with the suggested approach, salaries would be based on pro-

Table 1
CRITERIA FOR DESIGNING AN ADMINISTRATIVE
SALARY STRUCTURE

Areas of Focus	Elements of Criteria
A. Personnel (Qualifications required)	Education (degrees, credit units), training (knowledge, expertise), certifications, experience, nature of any special skills or expertise (e.g., knowledge of computer technology), and others.
B. Task (Duties performed or behaviors executed)	Description of tasks actually per- formed, time demands (length of day, evening and weekend time commit- ments), quantity and frequency of con- tacts with public, nature of any unique services performed (negotiating, in- service training, public relations, cam- paigning for bond issues, budget), and others.
C. Structure (Authority and responsibilities assigned)	Nature of delegated authority and assigned duties, status in relation to other administrative and non-administrative positions, span of control, number of people supervised and evaluated, financial responsibility (amount of fiscal authority and accountability), and others.
D. Environment (Situational factors or working conditions)	Degree of conflict and tension of specific position, degree of pressures and stress of assigned tasks, degree of creativity and innovation required, nature of the composition of student body (minority?) and community (low socioeconomic status?), condition and adequacy of facilities, adequacy of staff, and so forth.

ductivity. In the simplest terms it means, "He who produces, receives." An administrator's salary ought to reflect his contribution to the school system. He should be paid for what he does, not for what he is, or where he is, or whom he knows within the system.

This approach lends itself readily to a fixed ratio, if the ratio system is the salary-determination method the local administrators desire. It is the most frequently used approach at this time. Almost half the school systems in cities of 300,000 or over use some form of index formula. As the school systems get smaller, the frequency of an index system increases so that some 65 percent of systems with pupil enrollment of 6,000-11,000 use an index system for establishing the salary of principals. The steps required would be as follows:

- 1. Establish the base line for computing the base administrative salary: for example, a 1.50 ratio of the midpoint in the teachers' salary schedule. This base salary would then represent the 1.00 ratio for administrators.
- 2. Establish the "ratio increment range" for each criterion, for example:

a. Personnel	.01 to .30
b. Task	.01 to .50
c. Structure	.01 to .40
d. Environment	.01 to .30
T ellis assetant and administration motomatical	ler could com

- In this system, an administrator potentially could earn a maximum ratio of 2.50 of the base salary.
- 3. Establish the "ratio value" for the elements within each criterion. For example, the doctorate from an accredited institution might carry a .05 ratio value; or, each year's experience, a .02 ratio value. These ratio values could be added until the maximum of the ratio increment range was reached. This acts as a limit.

Once the details of the base line, the ratio increment range, and the ratio value have been decided upon, individuals can be rated and placed on the scale easily.

Two important characteristics of this system should be noted. First, a maximum would be set for each criterion and for the

salary range as a whole (2.50 of base in the example given). A person could earn ratio values that are disallowed upon reaching the maximum. Controls, therefore, are built into the system so that a reasonable predictability for budget purposes is possible.

Second, negotiations would take place over ratios (values or ranges), not dollars: the focus is on scales, not people. This allows for a consistent and manageable method of establishing salary increments from year to year and a technique that more realistically rewards a person's contributions to the school system.

Thus, a system of salary determination with a rationale, consistency, and reasonable predictability is both possible and feasible.

This approach, however, raises the serious problems of stability and the capacity of a school system to support a fixed index ratio. No organizational system remains constant. Job descriptions will vary no matter what criteria are employed. Furthermore, equity will demand that these descriptions be reviewed periodically (every two or three years) according to the established criteria.

# Alternative Ways to Develop Salary Schedules

Once a school district has decided on role (job) descriptions and developed procedures suited to achieve job objectives, then it is ready to develop a salary schedule. There are a number of possible ways, in addition to the one already cited, to construct a salary schedule. Five options are identified below:

- 1. An index ratio based on the feachers' salary schedule. Such an approach is expressed in the following formula:
  - $C = B (R \times T) + F$ , where
  - C == Administrator's compensation
  - B = Base teachers' M.A. maximum salary plus any additional levels of training attained by the administrator.
  - R = Role ratio which encompasses knowledge, skills, responsibility, and so on.



T = Time ratio between the regular school day and school year for teachers and the principal.

F = Fringe benefits such as longevity, tax sheltered annuity

contribution, or super-maximums.

- 2. An index based on a minimum administrators' salary.

  Ratios would represent differentials between administrative roles; no reference would be made to teachers' salaries. For example, the lowest scheduled administrative salary might represent the base. Or, a variation of this approach which might be advantageous, is one that reflects the current emphasis on the administrative or management team concept of school administration. Here a district might base the principal's salary on that of the superintendent. The salaries for other administrative positions would be computed using varied ratio differentials. To this would be added a training differential. Such a scheme would require an increment step schedule to account for the service factor.
- 3. A direct index ratio based on the teachers' salary at the principal's appropriate level of training and experience. This is a variation of option 1.

4. No salary schedules for administrators (completely individ-

ualized negotiations).

5. A basic schedule supplemented by individual negotiations, such as is currently employed in the performing arts (actors, entertainers), among other areas.

Alternatives 1 and 2 appear to be the more efficient methods of salary administration. They minimize inconsistencies of application because no fixed sums are involved, thereby assuring internal equity, consistency of application, and predictability. Moreover, they facilitate the flexibility necessary to meet changing objectives and roles. This is possible with a minimum of conflict because only the role and time ratios must be adjusted through collective negotiations. After such adjustments, the rational differentials among roles still maintain a constant relationship. For purposes of illustration, examples are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

24

Table 2
DIRECT RATIO INDEX SALARY STRUCTURE
(Teacher's Salary)

Position	Role Ratio*	Time Ratio
High School Principal	1.60	1.15
Junior High School Principal	1.50	1.15
High School Assistant Principal	1.35	1.075
Junior High Assistant Principal	1.30	1.075

Using the Table 2 structure, the salary for one high school principal would be computed as follows (assume the base teacher's salary is \$15,000.)

$$C = B (R \times T) + F$$
  
\$29,100 = \$15,000 \times (1.60 \times 1.15) + \$1500

Table 3
DIRECT RATIO INDEX SALARY STRUCTURE
(Superintendent's Salary)

Position	Role Ratio*	Time Ratio*
High School Principal	·7	.1
Junior High School Principal	.6	.1
High School Assistant Principal	•5	.025
Junior High Assistant Principal	•4	.025

Using the Table 3 structure, the salary for one high school principal would be computed as follows (assume the base superintendent's salary is \$35,000):

$$C = B (R + T) + F$$
  
\$29,500 = \$35,000 × (.7 + .1) + \$1500

Many school administrators and boards believe that alternatives 4 and 5 are not desirable for setting salaries at this stage in the development of performance assessment techniques. They are difficult to put into practice because of the lack of explicitly stated and rationally derived criteria. These approaches also depend to a great extent upon individual ability as a negotiator and frequently on prior professional reputation. They tend to be limited to the one-high-school systems at the present time.

<sup>\*</sup> Ratios are illustrative only.

The basis for compensation should, as previously stated, be expertise brought to the role, and not the role itself. An explicitly devised *role ratio index* accounts for such expertise gained through training and experience. Under current practices in many schools, administrators are receiving varying rewards for the same training and experience.

Another issue in considering administrative salaries is that of conflict of interest resulting from direct indexed ratios. This is a critical question because administrative salaries in public education are implicitly related to a teacher base, regardless of how they are devised. If we may borrow terminology from game theory, a fixed sum game in negotiations does not exist. In the private sector, the resources (profit) for managerial salaries can be increased in direct proportion to the lowering of labor costs. Such a condition is not present in public education. However, conflict of interest is present where building administrators serve as negotiating agents for the board in teacher salary matters. This conflict is resolvable through modification of the negotiating role played by building administrators. For example, secondary principals might act as resource specialists, or agents of the board of education, where issues relating to their areas of jurisdiction and expertise are under consideration in the negotiations, but remain apart when salaries and fringe benefits are being negotiated.

In those communities where principals have found it desirable to organize their own negotiating units, their salaries will be determined through the activities of this unit.

Finally, the topic of state-mandated salary minimums should be mentioned. Some eleven states have provisions for principals in their minimum-salary laws. States handle the subject in various ways, including schedules which provide recognition for training and experience, supplements to the teacher salary schedule, and amounts to provide additional pay for work done beyond the regular school year.

Many authorities believe that the idea of minimum-salary laws has a built-in danger of the minimum becoming the maximum for the position rather than a "floor" that supports much

higher salaries. And yet, if the precedent of state minimum salary laws for teachers holds true for those laws referring to principals (and, at this writing, three times as many states have such laws for teachers than have such for both), this fear is unfounded. The basis for this opinion follows:

According to a recent report, "... mandated minimum teachers salaries, even though set at lower than desirable levels, have served and continue to serve as an effective device to improve salary standards, for successive increases in the teacher pay scales established by law are generally accompanied by increased state appropriations to the localities for salary purposes." And, "built into these higher legally prescribed salaries is a measure of local responsibility placed by law on the school systems over and above the state school support." 1

### Summary and Recommended Procedures

No effective compensation system can be devised in a piecemeal, fragmented manner. Therefore, in determining administrators' salaries, consideration must be given to all other positions in the school system.

In developing any compensation plan, the first step is to identify the roles and functions needed to achieve the organizational goals and explicit program objectives. The board of education, therefore, with the assistance of the professional staff, must first agree on goals.

The next step should be to evaluate and describe the elements of each position; by "elements," we mean such things as technical skills, knowledge required, and scope of responsibility delegated. These are complex factors that do not lend themselves to precise measurement. One measure of knowledge is formal training; another is certification; a third is the experience of solving similar problems. In much the same way, "scope of delegated

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> State Minimum-Salary Laws for Teachers. Research Report 1968-R15. National Education Association, 1968. p. 13.

responsibility" covers many factors: span of control; level of instruction; breadth of program; number of persons evaluated; quantity and frequency of contacts with the public; fiscal authority and accountability; and the extent of decision-making and creative thinking required.

The next major step is to decide on the relative importance of each position (in terms of the descriptions), with particular attention given to graded authority, responsibility, and difficulty.

Finally, assign a monetary differential for the several classes of positions. The following questions should be considered in arriving at the differentials:

1. Are the salaries commensurate with the described duties and responsibilities?

2. Will the salaries attract and maintain the kind of personnel desired?

3. Do the salaries reflect the intention to employ administrative leadership rather than merely managerial service?

- 4. Does the salary plan provide for increases over a period of years upon evidence of satisfactory service? Stated another way, does the salary plan provide safeguards against favoring persons with long tenure and minimal performance at the expense of those who meet performance standards?
- 5. Is the plan internally consistent; is it competitive with other systems' plans?

After a salary plan is devised it should be measured against the five questions listed below:

- 1. What are its cost implications? These costs could be related to a program budget instead of a conventional object budget in order to increase public support for schools.
- 2. Is it politically feasible in regard to the probable reaction of the community, the board, administrators, and teachers?
- 3. Does it meet legal prescriptions?
- 4. Is there precedent for its institution?
- 5. Can it be administered effectively with a degree of predictability regarding performance, outcomes, and costs?



If the plan answers all or most of these questions satisfactorily, an arrangement should be devised that assures a smooth transition from the old to the new schedule. It is also necessary to agree on procedures that allow for periodic evaluation and revision to account for new positions, redirection of goals, and adjustments that will maintain internal equity and uniformity within roles.

In this statement, the author would like to extend the discussion of the principal's compensation by considering the following questions:

- 1. What is the national trend for principals' salaries?
- 2. How do principals' salaries compare with those of executives filling similar positions in the private sector?
- 3. What are some trends that can be projected for principals' compensation in the future?

## National Salary Trends

One of the most respected salary surveys is published annually by School Management magazine in its "Cost of Education Index." In the 11th compilation, published this January, we find the following significant information: 1

First, inflation has had as severe an impact on education as it has had on every other aspect of the economy. While expenditures for instruction — which include principals' salaries — have risen 123 percent over the past nine years, the inflation index rose an estimated 63 percent.

In other words, merely to duplicate the instructional program that cost \$201 during the 1958-59 school year, current expenditures would have to total \$328. Expenditures have risen to \$449, thus providing a "real" increase of only \$121.

Stated in another way, \$6.30 of every \$10 added to a school system's budget has been burned up by inflation.

During 1969-70, salaries for principals, vice principals, and other non-classroom instructional personnel<sup>2</sup> rose 5.2 percent, compared to an approximate 6 percent gain in the "inflation index." Consequently, it is safe to assume that a large portion

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>"Cost of Education Index." School Management. Orland F. Furno and James E. Doherty. January, 1970. p. 35.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Guidance counselors are another major group.

of the membership in NASSP "earned more last year but enjoyed it less!"

The national median salary for this group (non-classroom instructional personnel) was \$11,625.01 in 1969-70. The national median for the high quarter was \$14,000; and for the high 10 percent, \$16,686.80.

It is important to note, however, that geographic location greatly influences these figures. For example, the national median for this group was \$11,625.01; the median for Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, however, was only \$8,713.43, while the median for Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, and Hawaii was \$14,023.29, a difference of \$5,309, or 62 percent.<sup>3</sup>

As might be expected, salaries of principals and instructional personnel other than classroom teachers are also related to the size of the school district. The median salary for this group in a small school district with actual enrollment in the 300-600 range was \$9,227.75, while the median salary in a very large school district with an enrollment of over 25,000 was \$12,815.06.4

Over the past three years, average per-pupil expenditures for teacher salaries have increased 6 percent overall, 10 percent for the high quarter, and 10 percent for the high 10 percent. Administrator salaries in the same period and the same categories have increased 4 percent, 11 percent, and nearly 10 percent. In actual dollars, the average teacher salary in the median district has increased \$1,859 since 1966-67. Over the same period, principals have had a \$2,306 pay rise.<sup>5</sup>

Thus, while some principals believe that teacher bargaining groups have at times negotiated increases to the detriment of the total education budget and their own salaries, the fact is that principals have kept pace—at least as far as national averages show.

National averages, of course, are not much help to many principals in financially hard-pressed school districts, as in one

<sup>3 &</sup>quot;Cost of Education Index." School Management. pp. 47-48.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 51.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 58.

major Eastern city where the financial crisis brought about a 21/2 percent salary reduction for principals.

To summarize the answer to the first question, "What is the trend for principals' salaries?" it can be reported that they have generally kept pace with the salaries of others in elementary and secondary education—but all groups have fought a delaying action against the eroding effects of inflation. In fact, less than half of the total increase in principals' salaries in the last ten years has resulted in spendable income.

## Salary Comparisons

The second question is even more complex: "How do principals' salaries compare with those of persons holding similar positions in the general job market?"

A general answer to this question ignores such important considerations as the psychological returns from a particular position, including status questions and transferability of skills.

Comparability with industry is also complicated by the fact that some industries pay better than others. Salary differentials between high paying and low paying industries can be substantial.

As a recent article in Nation's Business<sup>6</sup> points out, there are several reasons for this. One seems to be the degree of difficulty of the management job. While it is hard to prove that managing is more difficult in any one type of company than in another, there are observable differences. Profitability of the industry is another factor. The more profitable industries tend to pay more. A third factor concerns the type of industry involved. Businesses that manufacture unique products, own patents, or boast of technological advances or some other distinctive factor tend to pay higher salaries; basic commodity businesses tend to pay lower salaries.

In studies of both education and industry, the author has been struck with the comparability of functions of a chief executive

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Nation's Business. November 1969. p. 60.

officer in any organization. As industry has moved away from organization by function toward the establishment of divisions or profit centers, they have created an echelon of "Level #2" executives; these are division managers or functional managers who report to the office of the chief executive.

Our professional experience tells us that these positions are much like those of the secondary school principal in terms of general responsibility.

Salaries for these division managers vary in proportion to their industries' sales volume.

The following table shows these salary levels.7

SALARIES OF LEVEL #2 EXECUTIVES: DIVISION MANAGERS AND FUNCTIONAL MANAGERS

Division Managers Size of division (by sales volume,	(ir	Salaries thousands)	
in millions)	High	Medium	Low
\$ 1 to 5	\$ 32	\$ 29	\$26
5 to 15	43	<b>37</b>	34
15 to 25	52	44	39
25 to 35	<b>59</b>	48	42
35 to 50	64	53	44
50 to 75	70	<b>58</b>	48
75 to 125	80	65	53
125 to 250	95	76	59
250 to 500	112	90	68
500 to 1000	135	108	<i>7</i> 8

From the data provided in this table, it can be seen that the smallest industry pays its division managers a medium salary of \$29,000 per year; the "high" average runs \$32,000; the low, \$26,000.

The next largest industry groups pays 37K, 43K, and 34K (K = thousands) in these three categories. At the top of the scale

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> *lbid.* p. 63.

are those major industries with sales volume over 500 million per year, where the range is from 78K to 135K, with an average of 108K.

You may be interested in the job factors that were analyzed to support the conclusion that the position of principal is approximately equivalent to that of division manager.

The point method of job grading prevalent in industry was used. This method considers the following factors:

- Skill—The education, experience, ingenuity, and initiative required of a position.
- 2. Effort—The special requirements of mental and physical effort required.
- 3. Responsibility—For supervision, for program, for resources, and for product.

The author has analyzed these factors in depth for school districts and has been impressed with the comparability of the principal's position with that of a division manager within industry.

To summarize the answer to the question of the comparability of principals' salaries: There are areas of comparability, and industry pays approximately 30-40 percent more for the same skills. But as mentioned earlier, this ignores the question of transferability of skills and psychic return.

## Future Salaries

Now for the third and possibly most interesting question: What about salaries for principals in the future, i.e., the 70's.

Principals' salaries will probably improve significantly. It would not be realistic to conclude that the reason for this will be the simple recognition—unprompted by crises—by citizens, parent organizations, and governing boards that it is vital to establish salary levels based upon the importance of the duties and responsibilities of the principals' position. General major salary adjustments will probably result from a number of less-than-desirable "outside catalysts."

There may well be a parallel between the college and university presidency of the 60's and the principalship of the 70's. In the early 60's, salaries of college and university presidents were extremely low; yet, such positions were coveted by those within education, industry, and government. Not only did the position title carry prestige, but it also had the erroneous "image" of being not too demanding. This "myth" was exploded in the mid-and late-60's as student activism emerged and financial difficulties made the position visibly challenging.

As a result of this greater visibility, presidential salaries within colleges and universities were significantly increased. In most cases, the responsibilities of the position remained basically unchanged, although to be sure the position's difficulties in certain areas did become more severe. What did change was recognition of the difficulty of the position by the public, governing boards, and members of local and state political entities.

Accompanying this new perception was the further realization—always implicit and often stated—that presidents were accountable for managing their institutions, and they must be ready and capable of assuming this responsibility.

During the 70's, the difficulties of the challenge facing principals will become more visible to the public. Student activism may become more pronounced, and the principal will have to explain and justify the relevancy of his school's educational program to news media, parents, and students. Teachers will continue to seek union representation, and the principal will continually have to weigh teacher demands against the capability of his school to accommodate them. Operating costs will continue to spiral, and the principal will have a major responsibility in the determination of new ways to continue to provide quality education within limited financial resources. The list of challenges could be extended, but these will serve as examples of what we mean.

These factors will provide the principals' position with visibility; the resultant recognition of the complexity and difficulty of the position will, in the 70's, result in a general upward salary adjustment in principals' salaries.

But, while the principal will enjoy greater compensation in the 70's, the new visibility of his position will require him to be a more effective administrator than ever before, as his performance will be more closely monitored. This intensified scrutiny, of course, means that he must learn to accept increased accountability, a subject that has been discussed in an earlier chapter.

Because of the visibility and accountability of the principal's position in the 70's, principals' salaries will slowly begin to approach the salaries of those in comparable positions in

industry.

Incidentally, the ability to measure the performance of the division managers and functional managers is another factor which in the past has contributed to this wide salary discrepancy between industry and education.

While there will be no "profit centers" in education in the 70's —thank goodness—principals will also have ample opportunity to demonstrate their ability to function effectively within

accountable positions.

The reader should not be misled by these statements: In spite of the fact that some inroads will be made toward closing the salary gap with industry, education will have to continue to attract those whose paramount interest is still service to youth.

There will be another important area of change: Emphasis will shift during the next decade from the question of salary to that of "total compensation." It is probable that more principals and their employers will come to recognize that the salary paid an executive is just one part of a larger compensation program.

While a school district does not have stock or stock options to offer its executives, it can construct very attractive total compensation plans. Among the elements of such programs will be:

 Significantly improved medical insurance plans, to include family dental coverage and extended benefit programs, as well as provision for annual physical examinations.

• Income protection plans, to include total disability programs.

- Increased emphasis on tax-sheltered annuities, including special programs to guarantee college expenses for dependents.
- Special contributions toward retirement, including maintenance of retirement centers.
- Special benefits, such as automobiles, other provisions for travel, and vacation centers.
- Special educational assistance, including tuition programs and special programs for in-service education.
- Bonus plans based on successful attainment of predetermined objectives.

This writer trusts that our society will come to realize that it must find better ways to reward those who are its most useful contributors. Principals can look forward to the 70's as a time of continual improvement in the compensation provided our educational leaders.

## Appendix

## Selected Data on Administrative Salaries

The data on principals' salary schedules that follow were compiled by Edna-Jean Hershey, Director of Personnel Practices and Procedures of the Denver Public Schools. Dr. Hershey collected this information originally for the Denver Public Schools' own administrative-supervisory team, in order to clarify somewhat the issue of the use of ratios based on teachers' salaries and ratios based on other administrators' salaries. She has graciously permitted NASSP to report the results of her efforts in this publication, for which we now express our most sincere appreciation.

NASSP warns the reader that because of the purpose of her study and the complexity of the data, it was necessary for Dr. Hershey to interpret some of the material that the various school systems sent to her. Neither she nor NASSP, therefore, can accept the responsibility for any interpretations that a particular school system may not consider as completely accurate.



ERIC

School District Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules

Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND Independent of teachers' schedule except for base pay factors

-Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.--\$6500-\$10,700 M.A.-\$7000-\$11,400 Doc.-\$8000-\$12,400 Formula: Base pay plus differential = maximum sulary

Base pay: basic schedule applicable takes into consideration:

(a) years of experience in the school system
(b) academic preparation, recognizing the A.B., M.A., M.A. + 34 semester hours, and Doc. degrees
Over the years, the teachers' M.A. maximum has proved to be rather constant as the basis of academic preparation.

Differential: recognizes:

(a) additional duty time (10- and 12-month positions)

(b) responsibility

As an example of what constitutes "responsibility," a breakdown of this factor for principals showed schools divided into 7 groups with each assigned a range of weighted composite standard scores computed on the basis of pupil population, size of professional staff, number of building employees, and program and organization (highest number of points for this).

Change to a higher principal group is possible on the basis of atypical or special situations, such as formulation and administration of a practice teaching program, in-service education for the District's teachers, training of students for specific occupational standards and for community service, school for the physically handicapped, student work-study programs, administration of more than one building, formal daily program in excess of 5 hours, and abnormally high pupil turnover.

Consideration of responsibilities inherent in other supervisory/administrative positions (compared to those of principals) plus professional judgment provide the basis for the setting of the salaries for such personnel.

Arbitrarily assigning a base of 1.00 to the 1968-69 differential paid to 12-month principals of schools with the lowest number of weighted composite standard scores (\$2600), the following ratios result for administrative-supervisory positions:

Supervisory/Adminis- trative Position	Work Year (School year = 188 days)	Arbitrary Differ- ential Ratios Applied
Principals:	All 12 months	
٧		. 1.00
1 <b>V</b>		. 1. <b>2</b> 3
IIIB		. 1.46
2:2:		4
11	•	. 1.92
18		. 2.15
•••	-continued-	-

40/ 41

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Accounting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries	
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND— continued		Work Year  Supervisory/Adminis- (School year = 188 days)  trative Position All 12 months	
		Assistant principals	1.00 1.00
		I	1.46 1.69 1.92
		l	2.46 2.77
		Principals VI	0.54 0.54 0.54
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries	-
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS	Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,250) = 1.00	Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Position (School year = 180 days)	Ratio Apply- ing
	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$6500-\$10,700	Doc	. 1.178
	M.A.—\$7050-\$11,250 Doc.—\$8150-\$12,350	Coordinators	1.255 1.255 1.375 1.425
•		Directors	1.375 1.40 1.45 1.60 1.65
		It is presumed that supervisory and administrative p beyond the Assistant Principal category would have degrees, but the printed schedule does not so indicat of pay for a given year appear to be for a flat an	Master's e. Rates



money.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries	
BUFFALO, NEW YORK	State law requires 1.3 ratio for principals above what they would receive as a teacher with comparable educa- tion and experience.  Other supervisory/ad- ministrative positions are independent of teachers' salary schadule except for education and longevity allowance.  Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$6800-\$10,700 M.A.—\$7405-\$11,605 Doc.—\$8310-\$12,510	Work Year	rs), and led for e con- ula has ompara- rer, the

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
CHICAGO,	Independent of teachers'	The salary schedule for principals is based on the number of
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS	schedule	teachers on the staff and provides for 10 steps to maximum.  Administrators on a 12-month basis have salary schedules
	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:	which provide for 5 steps to maximum.
	A.B.—\$7350-\$11,025	In the listing below, a base of 1.00 is arbitrarily assigned
	M.A.—\$7770-\$11,812.50	to the maximum salary for principals of schools assigned the
	Doc.—\$8230·\$12,640	fawest number of teachers (\$16,054.50) with other ratios also based on maximum for the position.
		continued



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Selicy Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salari	
CHICAGO,			Arbi-
ILLINOIS		Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year	trary
continued		VOIMINISTIBLIA	·'atio
			Applied
		Principals:	
		Up to 21 teachers 200 days plus 10 days	
		21.1-32 teachers paid vecation for all	
		32.1-43 teachers principals 43.1-56 teachers	
		56.1-77 teachers	
		77.1-120 teachers	
		120.1 and over	
		teachers	1.21
		Assistant Directors	
		(category I) 12 calender months	. 1.10
		Directors:	
			. 1.18
			1.26
			1.35
		Category V	1.55
		category resulting. 8-hour a day teachers in a or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' school a month at minimum for 10 months: the ext	ring total
		or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figuresching staff.	iring total  Idule plus  ra amount  Ith in the
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Solary Schedules	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension and the largest schools to \$160 a month in the largest schools to \$160 a month in the largest in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selection Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selection	edule plus re amount th in the acheols.
	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schodules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selari Master's degree apparently highest recognition preparation.	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  mt les given to
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Selary Schedules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A.	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selection Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selection.  Supervisory/	ering total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  mt tes given to
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schodules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension and the schools to \$160 a month in the largest in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Solar Master's degree apparently highest recognition preparation.  Supervisory/Administrative Work Year	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Solary Schodules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension and the schools to \$160 a month in the largest in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selection.  Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year  (School year = 182 days)	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  mt les given to Apply-
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Solary Schodules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selection.  Supervisory/Administrative Position (School year = 182 days)  Principals:	ering total adule plus re amount th in the acheols.  mt les given to Apply-
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Solary Schodules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of \$10,245 as 1967-68 is	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month in the largest at maximum (5th year) Administrative Selection  Master's degree apparently highest recognition preparation.  Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year  (School year = 182 days)  Principals: Elementary:	ering total adule plus re amount th in the acheols.  mt tes  given to Apply- ing
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Solary Schodules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month in the largest at maximum (5th year) Administrative Selection Supervisory/Administrative Position (School year = 182 days)  Principals:  Elementary:  Under 450 pupils	ering total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  mt tes given to Apply- ing
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Solary Schodules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of \$10,245 as 1967-68 is the latest year for	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools which is smallest schools a month in the largest smallest schools which is smallest schools a month in the largest smallest schools which is smallest schools a month in the largest smallest schools which is smallest schools a month in the largest smallest schools which is smallest	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  Ratio Apply- ing  1.20 1.37
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Selary Schedules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of \$10,245 as 1967-68 is the latest year for supervisory and administrative salaries (NEA).	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month in the largest at maximum (5th year) Administrative Selection Supervisory/Administrative Position (School year = 182 days)  Principals:  Elementary:  Under 450 pupils	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  Ratio Apply- ing  1.20 1.37 1.51
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Solary Schedules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of \$10,245 as 1967-68 is the latest year for supervisory and administrative salaries (NEA).  On a few occasions, they	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools \$160 a month in the largest smallest schools \$160 a month in the largest schools \$160 a month in the l	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  Ratio Apply- ing  1.20 1.51 1.67
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Solary Schedules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of \$10,245 as 1967-68 is the latest year for supervisory and administrative salaries (NEA).  On a few occasions, they have also given across-	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month in the largest at maximum (5th year) separations and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Solar Principals:  **Work Year**  **Work Year**  **Position**  **Cansiderations and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Solar Position**  **Work Year**  **Position**  **Cansiderations and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Solar Position**  **Work Year**  **Position**  **Cansiderations and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Solar Position**  **Work Year**  **Position**  **Cansiderations and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Solar Position**  **Position**  **Considerations and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Solar Position**  **Work Year**  **Position**  **Considerations and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Solar Position**  **Position**  **Considerations and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Solar Position**  **Position**  **Considerations*  **Work Year**  **Position**  **Considerations*  **Considerations*  **Considerations*  **Work Year**  **Position**  **Considerations*  **Considerations*  **Considerations*  **Work Year**  **Position**  **Considerations*  **Consideration	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  Ratio Apply- ing  1.20 1.37 1.51 1.67
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Selary Schedules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of \$10,245 as 1967-68 is the latest year for supervisory and administrative salaries (NEA).  On a few occasions, they have also given across-the-board increases.	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extent at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at minimum for 10 months; the extent at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month in the largest schools to \$160 a month in the largest schools are schools to \$160 a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a school are schools are schools as a school are schools are schools are schools are schools as a school are schools are scho	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  Ratio Apply- ing  1.20 1.51 1.55 1.22
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. meximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of \$10.245 as 1967-68 is the latest year for supervisory and administrative salaries (NEA).  On a few occasions, they have also given across-the-board increases.  Teachers' Schedule	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month in the largest schools to \$160 a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools are schools are schools as a school are schools are	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  Ratio Apply- ing  1.20 1.51 1.67 1.33
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Selary Schedules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. meximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. meximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. meximum of \$10,245 as 1967-68 is the latest year for supervisory and administrative salaries (NEA).  On a few occasions, they have also given across-the-board increases.  Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month smallest schools to \$160 a month in the largest in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selection  Supervisory/Administrative  Position (School year = 182 days)  Principals:  Elementary:  Under 450 pupils	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  mt the given to  Ratio Applying  1.20 1.51 1.67 1.33 1.31
District CINCINNATI,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Ratio based on teachers' M.A. meximum = 1.00  1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is \$10.376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of \$10.245 as 1967-68 is the latest year for supervisory and administrative salaries (NEA).  On a few occasions, they have also given across-the-board increases.  Teachers' Schedule	or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figure teaching staff.  All assistant principals are on the teachers' schools a month at minimum for 10 months; the extension at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month at maximum (5th year) ranges from \$60 a month in the largest schools to \$160 a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools as a month in the largest schools are schools are schools are schools as a school are schools are	ring total adule plus ra amount th in the acheols.  Ratio Apply- ing  1.20 1.37 1.51 1.67 1.33 1.31 1.37



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Solary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Takon into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selectes
CLEVELAND, OHIO	Index or ratio plan was abandoned in January, 1967 as a result of negetiations with the Union representing the administrative group.	40-week work year for principals, assistant principals, supervisors, and coordinators. Work year for other supervisory and administrative personnel apparently in excess of 40 weeks but not over 48 weeks. Teachers apparently work 38 weeks as the following administrative premotion formule would indicate:
	However, comperison of former raties with the current salary schedule indicates that hasically maximum salaries still retain a ratio relationship.	ADD (+) Items 1, 2, and 3:  1. Current salary or salary for ensuing year \$  2. Responsibility differential for present position  3. One increment for new position (\$400 for certain ones; \$500 for others)
·	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$6250-\$9600 M.A.—\$6550-\$10,750 M.A.+—\$6550-\$11,000	ADD (+) Item 4a:  4a. 2/38 of Sub-total A (change from 38 to 40 weeks)
		Salary for new position \$ Assuming that the teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,316) is at least unofficially recognized as a besis of 1.00, the following ratios result:
•		Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Apply- Position (School year = 183 days) ing
		(Only those working 40 weeks shown) Principals:
		Elementary—1000 or less pupils 1.30
		Junior High—1000 or less pupils
		Senior High—1800 or less pupils
		Assistant Principals:
		Elementary 1.15
		Junior High
		Senior High
		Supervisor
		Assistant Supervisor
		Directing Supervisor 1.40
		\$500 more a year paid to:  Elementary principals with 1001 or more pupils or responsible for two schools.  Junior high principals with 1001 or more pupils.
		Senior high principals with 1801 or more pupils.
		No allowance for service in disadvantaged or lower socio- economic arees.
		Longevity increments of \$300 apply after 25, 30, and 35 years in Cleveland Public School service.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules		ns and Factors Takon into uporvisory/Administrative	
DALLAS, TEXAS	Independent of teachers' salary schedule	positions (except for	uired for supervisory and Lunchroom Department and M.A. salary schedule	supervisory p
	Teachers' Schedule	schedule for those	with earned dectorate.	
	1968-69: A.B.—\$5800-\$8150	State administratori	s certificate required fo	iil-
•	M.A.—\$6100-\$9100	assistant principals.	State supervisor's co	r principais a r <b>tificate</b> requi
	Doc\$7000-\$9850	for consultants, co- instructional supervi	ordinators, and directors	s serving in
		the following ratios	work Year	o the M.A. a
		Position (Sc	$thool\ year = 9\ months)$	M.AMaxC
		Elementary Principal	s:	
		ADA of less than 2	250 10½ months	1.00 1
		ADA of less than 2 ADA of 250-399	10½ months	1.02
		ADA of less than 2 ADA of 250-399 ADA of 400-649	10½ months 10½ months	1.02 1 1.04 1
		ADA of less than 2 ADA of 250-399 ADA of 400-649 ADA of 650 or mo	10½ months 10½ months re 10½ months	1.02 1 1.04 1 1.07 1
		ADA of less than 2 ADA of 250-399 ADA of 400-649 ADA of 650 or mo Junior High Princip		1.02 1 1.04 1 1.07 1 1.18 1
		ADA of less than 2 ADA of 250-399 ADA of 400-649 ADA of 650 or mo Junior High Princip	10½ months 10½ months 10½ months 10½ months 11 months 11 months	1.02 1 1.04 1 1.07 1 1.18 1
		ADA of less than 2 ADA of 250-399 ADA of 400-649 ADA of 650 or mo Junior High Princip Senior High Princip Sex*stant Principels: E.ementary	10½ months 20½ months 10½ months 10½ months 11 months 11 months 11 months	1.02 1 1.04 1 1.07 1 1.18 1
		ADA of less than 2 ADA of 250-399 ADA of 400-649 ADA of 650 or mo Junior High Princip Senior High Principels: 1.omentary Junior High	10½ months 10½ months 10½ months 10½ months 11 months 11 months 11 months 11 months 11 months	1.02 1 1.04 1 1.07 1 1.18 1 1.30 1 1.00 1 1.02 1
		ADA of less than 2 ADA of 250-399 ADA of 400-649 ADA of 650 or mo Junior High Princip Senior High Principels: 1.omentary Junior High	10½ months 10½ months 10½ months 10½ months 11 months 11 months 11 months 10 months 10 months	1.02 1 1.04 1 1.07 1 1.18 1 1.30 1

At the discretion of the superintendent, principals of high schools with ADA of 2500 or more may be allowed \$700 (one increment) above maximum scheduled.

Elem. and Sec. ..... 12 months

Supervisors ..... 10 months

1.60

1.60 1.48

1.48 1.18

1.02

1.67

1.67 1.55

1.55 1.25

1.09

Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- Schou! trative and Teacher Considerations and Factors Taken into Accor District Salary Schodules in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salar				
DENVER, COLORADO	Presumably independent of teachers' salary schedule, but former ratio index besed on the teachers' M.A. maximum (\$10,625) is still evident = 1.00.  Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$600C-\$9575 M.A.—\$6200-\$10,625 Doc.—\$6200-\$11,690	Wark Yana	apple Edu	
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teecher Salary Schodules	Considerations and Factors Tahon into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selaries		
DETROIT, MICHIGAN	Index plan with teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,700) == 1.00	Recognize advanced degrees in salary schedule for visors and administrators. Responsibilities and acceptly are also reflected in the schedule, but the socioed status of an area is not.	untabi	
	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B\$7500-\$11,200 M.A\$8000-\$11,700 Doc\$8600-\$12,700	Applying the teachers' M.A. maximum to M.A. m salaries for administrators and supervisors, the foration result:	aximu Howi	

Recognize advanced degrees in salary schedule for sup- visors and administrators. Responsibilities and accountab- ity are also reflected in the schedule, but the socioeconom- status of an area is not.
Applying the teachers' M.A. maximum to M.A. maximus salaries for administrators and supervisors, the following ratios result:

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Safary Schedule-	Considerations and Factors Taken Into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
DETROIT,		Supervisory/ Ratio
MICHIGAN		Administrative Work Year Apply.
continued		Position (School year = 39 weeks) ing
		Principals:
		Elementary
		Secondary
		Building Trades 12 months 1.58
		Assistant Principels:
		Elementary
		Secondary
		Building Trades         12 months         1.36           Coordinator         39 weeks         1.15
		Supervisor
		Assistant Director 12 months 1.46
		Director
		ant principals of certain schools are placed on the ele- mentary principal and assistant principal salary schedule. Pupil enrollment is the determining factor, but the size of the enrollment is not explained. Classification of schools by size is done annually.
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Tacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Solting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
FORT WORTH, TEXAS	Index plan with teachers' M.A. maximum (\$6069) == 1.00	School year is 9 months. Length of work year for principals and secondary vice-principals is 12 months.
		Ratios Applying Based on ADA of:
	Board of Education sets	Supervisory/Adminis- 200- 301- 751- 1100- 1451- 1800-
	salary of superintendent and the assistant	trative Position 300 750 1099 1450 1799 2150
	and the assistant superintendents.	Principals:
	auperincencents.	Elementary 1.32 1.38 1.45 1.51 1.57 1.64 Middle and Jr. High 1.40 1.46 1.52 1.58 1.64 1.71
	Teachers' Schedule	0-1-11-4
	1968-69:	Senior High
		Junior High/Middle 1.17 1.23 1.29 1.35 1.41 1.47
	A.B.—\$5729·\$7669	Senior High
	M.A.—\$5969-\$8069	2nd V-P, Jr. High 1.11 1.17 1.23 1.29 1.35 1.41
	Doc.—\$6569-\$8669	2nd V-P, Sr. High 1.13 1.19 1.25 1.32 1.38 1.45
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
		Salary for elementary assistant principals is based on a work year of 9½ months with the following ratios applying:
		1.11 1.12 1.14 1.16 1.18 —continued—



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries	
FORT WORTH, TEXAS—continued		Position Work Year	Ratio Apply- ing
		Consultants	1.69
		Assistant Directors	om 1.50
		Coordinator, Instr. Materials 12 months	. 1.60 . 1.45 . 1.36 or M.A.
	Relationship between	for M.A. + 36 sem, hours; \$600 for Doc.	
School District	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Takon into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries	
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA	Board of Education an- nually sets salary of	(1) Base selery: Minimum Maxin Experi- Experi-	num
	High School principals (currently \$18,447).  Salary for other supervisory/administrative personnel based on:  (1) Base salary: index ratio based on begin-	Degree   Crice   Ratio   ence	1.63 1.88 1.96 2.03
	ning teacher's salary with A.B. degree (\$6,094) = 1.00. (2) Differential added to base salary, but method not explained.	as one factor with other factors apparently conducted but not specifically mentioned. The differential expressed in dollar amounts paid either for 19-periods or for calendar months. For comparating poses, but not to be confused with the ratios of (1) above, the annual differential of \$1,656	als are day pay ve pur- lown in paid to
	Flat amount added per 19-day pay period or	elementary principals in Group II is considered a in the following table:	is 1.00 Differ-
	per calendar month, depending on the position.	Work Year Position (School Year = 190 days)	ential Ratio
	Teachers' Schedule To 12-12-68: A.B.—\$5859-\$9353 M.A.—\$6343-\$10,535	Principals:  Elementary I	1.00
	Doc.—\$6773-\$11,395 From 12-13-68: A.B.—\$6094-\$9727	Elementary	0.43 0.94 0.43
	M.A.—\$6597-\$10,956 Doc.—\$7044-\$11,851	11 calendar months 12 calendar months —continued—	0.47 0.51



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA— continued		Work Year Differential  Position (School Year = 190 days) Ratio  Athletic Director
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selaries
JACKSDNVILLE, FLORIDA	Basic salary schedules for teachers plus salary supplements based on a 10, 11, or 12 months work year and levels of responsibility.	Administrative and supervisory positions are divided into 1 categories or levels of responsibility with each subdivide according to the length of the work year. Arbitrarily usin the annual supplement (\$687.50) for principals with the smallest staff as a basis of 1.00, the following ratios result for other representative positions:
		Supervisory/ Suppl
	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:	Administrative Work Year men Position (School year = 10 months) Rati
	A.B.—\$6000-\$9000 M.A.—\$7000-\$10,000 Doc.—\$8400-\$11,400	Principals: Schools with less than 18 teachers 11 months 1.00 Elementary—18 or more teachers 11 months 1.50 Junior High—18 or more teachers 11 months 2.50 Senior High—18 or more teachers 12 months 2.70 Vocational—18 or more teachers 12 months 2.70
		Assistant Principals (in schools with 18 or more teachers)
		Jr. High, Sr. High, or Vocational 10 months 1.3  Deans—Jr. High, Sr. High, or
		Vocational         10 months         1.1           Directors—various areas and specialties:         12 months         4.3           Level 2         12 months         3.2
		Level 2
		Coordinators—various areas and specialties:  Level 4
		Level 5
		specialties
		pletion of 15 semester hours above requirements for ear of 3 advanced graduate State certificates.



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries	_
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA	teachers' M.A. maximum (\$12,410) plus one increment = 1.00	The annual increment for 10-month administrative supervisory personnel is \$370; for 12-month personnel is \$370; for 12-month personnel increment was subtracted from salaries listed before applying the teachers' M.A. main order to arrive at the applicable ratio shown below	sonnel, om the ximum
	Teachers' Schedule	Supervisory/	Ratio
	1968-69: A.B.—\$6730-\$10,800	Administrative Work Year	Apply-
	M.A.—\$7600-\$12,410	Position (School year = 10 school months)	ing
	Doc\$9005-\$14,555	Principals:	
		Elementary and Jr. High 10 calendar months (217 days)	
		Less than 20 ctfd. staff	1.27
		20-40 certificated staff	1.33
		41 or more ctfd. staff	1.39
		Senior High 12 calendar months	1.70
		Assistant Principals—Sr. High 10 calendar months Vice Principals—	1.18
	•	Elem. & Jr. High 10 calendar months	1.18
		Senior High	1.24
		Assistant Supervisors, Assistant Directors, and Consultants I 10 calendar months	1.18
		12 calendar months	1.41
		Consultants II 10 calendar months	1.27
		12 calendar months	1.52
		Supervisors and Consultants III 10 calendar months	1.33
		Directors I	1.86 2.03
		Master's degree or less is the preparation base for the positions with the exception of the directors for who one salary scale is provided. For the rest, higher apply for one year above the Master's, two years about Master's, and the doctorate.	m only salarie
		Nine steps to maximum for directors; seven steps to mum for the rest of the positions listed.	o maxi
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries	
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA	40 mester salary sched- ules, each with 5 steps minimum to maximum, are set up for administra- tive/supervisory positions.	A 2.75% differential exists between the master salary ules, and a 5.5% differential between the steps is schedule. The dollar amount for each step represe salary earned per 4-week pay period. To arrive at nual salary, the pay period salary, in turn, is multiple for those working 40 weeks per year; by 10.85 for working 43 weeks per year; and by 13.05 for those 12 calendar months.	in eac ents th the an plied b or thos



---continued-

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Tahon into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA— continued	The steps in each such schedule are arrived at by multiplying a responsibility factor (established for each step and carried out to 5 decimals) by the maximum step in the salary schedule for teachers with an A.B. degree + 98 semester hours of additional arrangements.	Example: The responsibility factor at Step 1 for senior high principals is 1.16395. Multiplying this factor by the \$1300 = \$1513 (pay for a 4-week period). Since senior high principals work 43 weeks per year, \$1513, in turn, is multiplied by 10.85 = \$16,416 (1968-69 annual salery).  Should the salary for the new position at time of appointment be below that paid for the former position, the person would be placed on the step of the appropriate master salary schedule which is next above his former salary.
	additional preparation (currently \$1300 per 4-week pay period).	Supervisory/ Master Salary Schedule Administrative Responsibility Factor Position Work Year Applying
·	The responsibility factor considers for each administrative/supervisory position such matters as organizationa! setting, kind and difficulty of work, authority accountability, personal relationships, supervision exercised and received, training, and experience.  Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$7000-\$9990 M.A.—\$7310-\$10,550 Doc.—\$8280-\$13,400 Los Angeles stated their teachers' salary schedule does not actually lend itself to a strictly degree basis as other factors enter in; suggested that NEA's interpretation (above) be used.	School year == 40   weeks
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Tales Into Account in Sotting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
LOUISVI!LE, KENTUCKY	Index ratio based on teachers' A.B. mini-mum (\$5800) == 1.00.	Supervisory and administrative positions require a Master's degree. ——continued——



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules		and Factors Taken		
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY—	Teechers' Schedule 1968-69:	Supervisory/ Administrative	Work Year		itio lying
continued .	A.B.—\$5800·\$9280 M.A.—\$6264-\$9744	Position (Sc	hool year = 186	days) Min.	Max.
	6 Yrs.—\$6728·\$10,208	Principals:	015 dawn	176	216
	• • • •	Elementary	215 days	176	216 216
		Junior High			229
		Senior High	225 uays	109	229
		Elementary	215 dave	164	204
		Junior High	215 days	164	204
		Senior High	215 uays	174	214
			225 uays	1/4	214
		Counselors: Elementary	215 days	165	205
		Junior High	215 days	105	205
		Senior High			214
•		Supervisors	225 uays	216 5	256.5
					236.3
		Assistant Supervisors	215 days	196	230
		Directors:	AH 12	212	252
		<u>.</u>		212	275.5
		<u> </u>		235.5	
				262.6	302.6
		Assistant Directors:	10	170	210
		<u>.</u>		170	
		<u>!!.</u>		203.6	243.6
		III		235.5	275.5
		Points, added for size	of faculty:		
		Elementary and junior index and ½ point a each teacher up to a Senior high: 1 point point added to assist	dded to assistant total of 42. t added to princ	principal's ir ipal's index	ndex for and ½
		up to a total of 50. \$250 super-maximum eligible.	increment paid	all those v	
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	\$250 super-maximum eligible.	increment paid s and Factors Takes	n Into Account	who are
MEMPHIS,	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Ratio besed on teachers'	\$250 super-maximum eligible.	s and Factors Take pervisory/Administ	n Into Account rative Salaries ve a Master's	who are
	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Ratio besed on teachers' M.A. maximum	\$250 super-maximum eligible.  Considerations in Setting Supervisory/	s and Factors Take pervisory/Administ principals must ha	n Into Account rativo Salarios vo a Master's	degree
MEMPHIS,	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Ratio besed on teachers'	\$250 super-maximum eligible.  Considerations in Setting Supervisory/ Administrative	s and Factors Take pervisory/Administ	n Into Account rative Salaries we a Master's	degree Ratio
MEMPHIS,	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Ratio besed on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$9120) = 1.00	\$250 super-maximum eligible.  Considerations in Setting Supervisory/ Administrative	s and Factors Take pervisory/Administ principals must ha	n Into Account rative Salaries we a Master's	degree Ratio
MEMPHIS,	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Ratio besed on teachers' M.A. maximum	\$250 super-maximum eligible.  Considerations in Setting Supervisory/ Administrative Position (Sci	and Factors Take pervisory/Administ principals must ha Work Year nool year = 190 d	n Into Account rative Salaries we a Master's Anays) Min	degree Ratio pplying
MEMPHIS,	Ratio besed on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$9120) == 1.00  Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:	\$250 super-maximum eligible.  Considerations in Setting Supervisory/ Administrative Position (Sci Principals:—all level: 0-576 pupils	and Factors Takes pervisory/Administ principals must ha  Work Year pool year = 190 des Elementary ar	n Into Account rative Salaries we a Master's Ai ays)  Min Junior 1.7	degree Ratio pplying
MEMPHIS,	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Ratio besed on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$9120) = 1.00  Teachers' Schedule	\$250 super-maximum eligible.  Considerations in Setting Supervisory/ Administrative Position (Sci Principals:—all level: 0-576 pupils	work Year  work Year  year = 190 d  B  High—190 da  High—190 da	n Into Account rative Salaries we a Master's Al ays)  Min Junior 1.7	degree Ratio pplying . Max 4 2.0
MEMPHIS,	Ratio besed on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$9120) == 1.00  Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$5700-\$8550	Considerations in Setting Sul All newly appointed p Supervisory/ Administrative Position (Sci Principals:—all level: 0-576 pupils	work Year year = 190 d B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B	n Into Account rative Salaries we a Master's Alays)  Min Junior 1.7 rys; 1.8 -210 days 1.9	degree Ratio pplying . Max 4 2.0 14 2.2
MEMPHIS,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Ratio besed on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$9120) == 1.00  Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$5700-\$8550 M.A.—\$6270-\$3120	\$250 super-maximum eligible.  Considerations in Setting Supervisory/ Administrative Position (Sci Principals:—all level: 0-576 pupils	work Year year = 190 d B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B	n Into Account rative Salaries we a Master's Alays)  Min Junior 1.7 rys; 1.8 -210 days 1.9	degree Ratio pplying . Max 4 2.0 14 2.2 15 2.3



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into According Supervisory/Administrative Sala	ount iries
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE		Supervisory/	Ratio
continued		Administrative Work Year Position (School year = 190 days)	Applying Min. Max.
		Assistant Principals:	
		577-1088 pupils Not given	1.67 1.79
		1089-1600 pupils	1.73 1.84
		1601- and over pupils	1.78 1.89
		Area Specialist Not given	1.19 1.61 1.48 1.74
		Supervisor Not given	1.74 2.00
		Assistant Director Not given	2.09 2.35
		Director Not given Department Coordinator Not given	
	Relationship between	Debartment Cooldinator (40) Bisen	2.70 2.96
School District	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Acco	ount ries
MIAMI, FLORIDA	Now independent of teachers' salary schedule.  Formerly based on index ratio; earlier to teachers' M.A. maxi-	Certificated supervisory and administrative salari gotiated separately from teachers' salaries. New before Board of Education proposed 10% in 1967-68 salaries. For comparative purposes the salaries have been increased 10% and the maximesulting for elementary principals in the smaller schools used as an arbitrary base of 1.00 (\$15,8).	v plan now crease over he 1967-68 mum salary elementary
	mum (now \$11,330); later to teachers'	Supervisory/	Arbitrary
	A.B. minimum tess \$200	Administrative Work Year Position (School Work - 105 days)	Ratio
	(now \$6650 — \$200 =	Principals: (School year = 196 days)	Applied
	\$6450) = 1.00.	Elementary 206 days	
	Teachers' Schedule	1000 or less pupils	1.00
	1968-69:	1001-1500 pupils	1.02
	A.B.—\$6650·\$10,650	Junior High 206 days	
	M.A.—\$7350-\$11,330	1000 or less pupils	1.03 1.06
	Doc.—\$8430-\$12,410	Senior High	1.00
		1500 or less pupils	1.21
		1501-2000 pupils	1.23
		2000 or more pupils	1.25
		Adult	1.18
		901 or more pupils	
		Directors 230 days	
			1.25
		Assistant Directors I 220 days	
		Assistant Directors I	1.17
		1	1.14
			. 1.08
		111	1.06
		Assistant Supervisors	
		and Coordinators 230 days	1.06
		II	



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN	Index plan with teachers' maximum for M.A. plus 64 units (\$12,358) = 1.00  Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$6800-\$10,810 M.A.—\$7072-\$11,326 Doc.—\$7616-\$12,358	Master's degree is basis of educational preparation for supervisory and administrative personnel. \$200 is added for attainment of each of the following levels of preparation M.A. + 16 units; M.A. + 32 units; M.A. + 48 units and M.A. + 64 units. At the elementary level, principal are divided into four classifications which take into consideration size of the faculty and other staff members supervised and pupil enrollment (breakdown by numbers numbers numbers).
		Respons
		Supervisory/ bility
		Administrative Work Year Ratio
		Position (School year = 190 days) Applyin
		Principals: All: 197 days
		Elementary—Classification 1
		Classification II
		Classification III
		Classification IV 1.41
		<b>A</b> • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
		Senior and 6-Year High
		Vice-Principals and Assistants to
		Secondary Principals:
		Elementary 190 days 1.15
		Junior High
		Senior and 6 Year High 195 days 1.26
		Supervising Teachers 200 days 1.11
		Supervisors 12 months 1.34
		Recreation Supervisors 12 months 1.33
		Coordinators 12 months 1.44
		Directors 12 months 1.57
		Recreation Directors   220 days 1.16
		Department Directors 12 months 1.42
		Assistant Directors of Divisions 12 months 1.55
		Executive Directors 12 months 1.67
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken Into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
AINNEAPOLIS,	Now independent of	Master's degree required for supervisory and administrative
IINNESOTA	teachers' salary schedules.	personnel. Advanced preparation recognized as follows: M.A. plus 15 quarter hours; M.A. plus 30 quarter hours; M.A. plus 45 quarter hours; and doctorate.
	Through 1966-67, an index plan was in	\$500 added to salary of elementary principals assigned to two schools.
	operation with the teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,920) = 1.00.	Arbitrarily assigning a base of 1.00 to the \$16,270 salar of the elementary principal for comparative purposes, the following ratios result:  —continued—



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schodules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Selting Supervisory/Administrative Selectes
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN	Index plan with teachers' maximum for M.A. plus 64 units (\$12,358) = 1.00  Teachers' Schadule 1968-69: A.B.—\$6800-\$10,810 M.A.—4./372-\$11,326 Dec.—\$7616-\$12,358	Master's degree is basis of educational proparation for supervisory and administrative personnel. \$200 is added for attainment of each of the following levels of preparation: M.A. + 16 units; M.A. + 32 units; M.A. + 48 units; and M.A. + 64 units. At the elementary level, principals are divided into four classifications which take into consideration size of the faculty and other staff members supervised and pupil enrollment (breakdown by numbers not shown).
	•	Raspensi
		Supervier:y/ bility
		Administrative Work Year Ratio
		Position (School year = 190 days) Applying
		Principals: All: 197 days
		Elementary—Classification I 1.32
		Classification II 1.35
		Classification III 1.38
		Classification IV 1.41
		junior High 197 days 1.45
		Senior and 6-Year High 200 days 1.53
		Vice-Principals and Assistants to
		Secondary Principals:
		Elementary 190 days 1.15
		Junior High 195 days 1.22
		Senior and 6-Year High
		Sypervising Teachers
		Supervise: 12 meetles 1.34
		Recreation Supervisors
		Coordinators
		Directors
		Recreation Directors 1
		Department Directors
		Assistant Directors of Divisions 12 months 1.55
		Executive Directors
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- tration and Teacher Salary Schodules	Considerations and Factors Talen into Account in Solting Supervisory/Administrative Solution
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA	New independent of teachers' salary schedules.	Mester's degree required for supervisory and administrative personnel. Advanced preparation recognized as follows: M.A. plus 15 quarter hours; M.A. plus 30 quarter hours; M.A. plus 45 quarter hours; and declarate.
	Through 1966-67, an index plen was in	\$500 added to salary of elementary principals assigned to two schools.
	eperation with the teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,920) = 1,00.	Arbitrarily assigning a base of 1.00 to the \$16,270 salary of the elementary principal for comparative purposes, the following ratios result:



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Solary Schodules	Considerations and Factors Takon into According Supervisory/Administrative Solari	
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA— continued	Teachers' Schedule 1968: (Calendar Year) A.B.—\$6000-\$9645	Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Position (School year = 190 days) Principals:	Arbitrary Ratio Applied
	M.A\$6600-\$11,920	Elementary 210 days	1.00
	Doc:\$7200-\$13,785	Junior High and Elementary-Jr, High 210 days	
	1969: (Calendar Year)	Senior High and Junior-Senior High 210 days Assistant Principals:	1.15
	A.B.—\$6700-\$10,425	Elementary 210 days	
	M.A.—\$7300-\$13,050	Secondary	0.97
	Dec\$7900-\$14,900	A 210 days	1.05
		B 210 deys	1.60
•		C	0.97
		Directors 12 month	s 1.31
		Assistant Directors	6 1.10
		Assistants 12 month	s 1.07

School Biotrict	Relationship between Supervisory/Admir/io- trative and Teacher Solery Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Select	
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY	Index ratio based on teachers' maximum for same amount of educational proporation (M.A.—\$11,500 or M.A. + 32 credits—\$11,900) == 1,00	All supervisory and administrative positions (Master's degree or the approved equivelent; M.A. additional credits or approved equivelent also (with additional salary.  Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year	. plus 32
	<b>V,</b>	Position (School year == 180 days)	Applying
	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$6700-\$11.100	Principals: All: 10 months Elementary—up to 800 pupils —over 800 pupils	1.35 1.46
M.A.—\$710 M.A. + 32-	M.A.—\$7100-\$11,500 M.A. + 32— \$7500-\$11,900	Senior High	. 1.58 : . 1.18
	2-1- <del>69</del> :	Junior High	. 1.22
	A.B.—\$6700-\$11,100 M.A.—\$7300-\$11,700 M.A. +—\$7900-\$12,300	Coordinator—Community Relations 12 months	1.49



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Takon into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selaries
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA	Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$9300) == 1.00 and is applied to salaries for principals, assistant principals, supervisors, associate directors, and most directors.  Salaries for directors in the highest category are based on comparison of salaries of like personnel in the 25 largest school districts.  Teachers' Schedule through 12-31-68 as on calender year basis:  A.B.—\$5400-\$8700 M.A.—\$5700-\$9300 Doc.—\$6300-\$9900	Master's degree required for appointment to supervisory and administrative positions.  Supervisory/ Administrative Position (School year = 182 days)  Principals: Pupils Teachers All: 182 days  Schools with: up to 400 0-12 401-900 13-30 901-1400 31-55 0ver 1400 over 55 1.36  Over 1400 over 55 1.46  Assistant Principals 182 days 1.21 Assistant Supervisors 12 months 1.45  Supervisors 12 months 1.60  Associate Directors 12 months 1.63  Directors in Group 4 12 months 1.75  The following salary is related to salaries paid for comparable positions in the 25 largest school districts and is not geared to the ratio above. If it were, the ratio shown would result:  Directors in Group 5 12 months 2.15  \$30 per pay period is added to salaries of principals and assistant principals with advanced preparation of 30 semester hours beyond the Master's degree; \$60 per pay period for an earned doctorate.
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Solary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Tahon into Account in Sotting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK	Actually independent of teachers' maximum M.A. salary (\$12,650), but does beer some relationship to it at cortain levels (assistant principals, junior principals, and principals). Also taken into consideration, but not explained in detail, are such additional factors as years of service and advanced preparation.	Assistant principals and junior principals are on a 3-step salary schedule; principals, on a 5-step salary schedule. The rest mentioned below are on a flat rate.  For comparative purposes, the maximum for elementary principals has been arbitrarily selected as a ratio factor of 1.00. Their maximum as of September 1, 1968, was \$20,270; as of March 1, 1969, \$20,525. Higher March salaries, however, provide the same ratio figures for the other job classifications listed as do the September 1, 1968 figures.  Supervisory/ Administrative  Work Year  Position  (School year = 189 days)  Applying  Principals:  Elementary  Junior High  192 days  1.00  Junior High  192 days  1.07  Senior High  Assistant Principals—all levels  Not given  0.85  Supervisor  Not given  0.84  Assistant Administrative Director  Not given  1.01  —continued—



School District	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Selary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Accin Setting Supervisory/Administrative Sal	
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK— continued—	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$6750-\$11,150 M.A.—\$8250-\$12,650 Doc.—\$9350-\$13,750 3-1-69: Doc.—\$9500-\$13,900	Supervisory/ Administrative Position (School year = 189 days)  Assistant Director Director Not given  Assistant principals and junior principals schools for socially maladjusted and emotiona children receive \$600 more a year; in schools retarded, \$200 more a year. Principals of school principals.	assigned to lly disturbed for mentally nools for the elementary
Silveri Defract	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schodules	There is no added compensation based on s considerations.  Considerations and Factors Taken into Acting Supervisory/Administrative Sal	count
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA	Index ratio based on teachers' B.A. mini- mum (\$5800) = 1.00	Master's degree for supervisory and administrat When positions with similar titles have dif- classifications (examples of supervisors and dire the differentiation is based on size of the staff magnitude of the job.	ferent salary actors below),
	1968-69: A.B.—\$5800-\$8816	Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Position (School year = 190 days)	Ratio Applying Min. Max.
	M.A.—\$6380-\$9396 Doc.—\$6960-\$9976	Principals:  Elementary—up to 399 pupils 11 months —400-699 pupils 12 months —400-699 pupils 12 months —700 and over pupils 12 months Junior High	1.63 2.09 1.70 2.10 1.80 2.20 1.90 2.40
		Assistant Principals:  Junior High	1.70 2.1 1.80 2.2 1.60 2.0
		Adult Education, Curriculum Mtls. 12 months Statistical Services	1.80 2.2 1.60 2.0 1.53 1.9 1.80 2.2
		Guidance, Special Projects	2.20 2.8 rk beyond th



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA	Independent of teachers' salary schedule. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:	Administrative/supervisory salaries are divided into six classifications. For comparative purposes only in the table below, maximum salary shown for principals in the smallest schools (\$15,644) is arbitrarily considered as a base ratio of 1.00 and is applied to the maximum salary for those in subsequent classifications.
	A.B.—\$6200-\$9560 M.A.—\$7068-\$11,160 Doc.—\$8804-\$13,268	Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Ratio Position (School year = 180 days) Applied
		Principals:     1-14 teachers     190 days     1.00       15-24 teachers     190 days     1.05       25-42 teachers     190 days     1.10       43-59 teachers     190 days     1.15       60 and over teachers     190 days     1.20
		Vice-Principals (3 classifications below that of the principal) In smaller schools
		In larger schools
		Assistant Program Director
		Instruction, Guidance—A Class 190 days 0.95  —B Class 190 days 1.00  —C Class 190 days 1.05  Assistant—Special Area—190 or 230 depending
		on position
		Supervisory and administrative appointments require a Master's degree; higher salaries for those with additional preparation: M.A. plus 1 year additional training and with an earned doctorate or it equivalent.
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Talon Into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
OMAHA, NEBRASKA	Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum	Relate length of work year to the position and to the salar —work year not given for all classifications listed below.
	(\$11,000) = 1.00	Aside from number of pupils, which is a factor recognized in the salary schedule for principals, additional personnel rather than salary differential, is added to the principalship of the more demanding schools.  —continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teecher Selary Sch2dules	Considerations and Factors: Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salarie	
OMAHA, NEBRASKA— continued	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—\$625C-\$10,063	Supervisory/ Administractive Work Year Position (School year = 190 days)	Ratio Applying
	M.A.—\$6875-\$11,000 Doc.—\$8125-\$12,250	Principals: Elementary 200 days Under 400 pupils 240-600 pupils Over 600 pupils 240 days Under 200 pupils 240 days Under 200 pupils 240 days Under 250 pupils 240 days Under 1500 pupils 240 days Under 1500 pupils 250-2000 p	1.18 1.23 1.19 1.25 1.41 1.39 1.48 1.57 1.15 1.29 1.14
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaric	
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA	Independent of teachers' schedule which is:  1968-69: A.B.—\$6700-\$10,900 M.A.—\$7000-\$11,400 Doc.—\$8300-\$13,300	Beginning with the 1969-70 school year, advance p for principals beyond the Master's degree will not nized. In lieu of this recognition, the Board of beginning September, 1969, is reimbursing each for tuition costs for a maximum of 6 comester professionally relevant college courses taken for year to a total maximum of 30 semester hours. At work on factors that determine the satting of su administrative salaries, but no final decision yell factors now taken into consideration in setting st principals is as follows:	be recog- Education, principal hours of credit per pervisory/ t reached.
		1. Number of classroom teachers as of October 31:  Elementary:  18 or less 19-23 24-28 29-23 34 or more  Junior High: 80 or less 81 or more  Senior High: 55 or less —-continued—	Points



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries	
PHILADELPHIA		56-110	
PENNSYLVANIA-		111 or more	. 70
continued		Special class teachers—any level:	. 2
		6-10	
		11.15	_
	_	16 or more	
	•	2. Percentage of teachers with less than 2 years' experience:	
		10.19	
		20.29	
		30-39	_
		40-49	_
		50-59	
		60-6970-79	
		80 or more	
		3. Vacancies as of October 31:	
		2.4	1
		5.9	
		10 or more	3
		4. Average monthly percentage of pupil mobility:	
		5-8	
		9-12	_
		13-16	
		5. Percentage of enrollment in a magnet program from outside the magnet school's boundaries:  5-9	2 3
		20 or more	
		Principals are then divided by levels, but the numpoints applicable at each level is not given. The masalary for principals at Level I (\$16,100) is an assumed to be a ratio of 1.00. Ratios are as follow Supervisory/ Administrative  Work Year	aximum bitrarily
		Position (School year = 190 days)	pplying
		Principals:	
		Elementary 190 days	
		Level 1	1.00
		Level II	1.06
		Level III	1.12
		Level IV	1.18 1.24
		Level V	1.27
		Level V	1.24
		Level VI	1.30
		Senic; High 190 days	
		Level VI	1.30
		Level VII	1.36
		Vice Principals	1.30



School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
TTTSBURGH, ENNSYLVANIA	Now independent of teachers' salary schedule, but is based on one that did take into account the teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00. Since not now applicable, this particular ratio is not applied.	Salaries are given by the month. Total salary for the year is arrived at by multiplying the monthly rate of pay by the number of months of work scheduled.  The ratios given below are arbitrarily based on the monthly M.A. maximum for principals (presumably elementary) in Group V, the lowest category. This M.A. maximum is \$1310 per month = 1.00. No explanation given as to the factor(s) involved in the various groups.
	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:	Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Ratio Position (School year == 191 days) Applied
	A.B.—\$6500-\$9800 M.A.—\$6800-\$10,400 Doc.—\$8000-\$11,600	Principals:   Group V
		which in Pittsburgh) plus rating of "good" or better.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries	
PORTLAND, DREGON	Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$10,600) == 1.00. (School district did not verify this, but NEA reports this basis.)	All supervisory and administrative personnel on a 225 standard work year unless otherwise indicated by the su intendent: 190-day work year for teachers plus one week a school closes plus two weeks before teachers report in fall plus 20 days during the summer months.  Supervisory/ Administrative  Work Year  Rational Applies	per- iftar the
	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:	Principals: (School year = 190 days) Apply  All: 225 days	ng
	A.B.—\$6000-\$9500 M.A.—\$6400-\$10,600	Elementary: 8 grades with 300-599 pupils—or less than 8 grades and 400 or more pupils 1.4	
		600 or more pupils	8
		Under 1000 pupils	-
		1000 or more pupils 1.7 High School Vice-Principals 225 days 1.4	_
		Supervisors—Certificated 225 days 1.4	
		235 days if ever	10
		so appointed 1.	54
		Directors—Certificated	
		235 days if ever	
		so appointed 1.3	-
		Assistant Supervisors—Classified 12 months 1.	
		Assistant Coordinators—Classified 12 months 1.	
		Supervisors—Classified	
	<u>.</u>	Classified supervisory personnel on the 12-month basis allowed vacations as follows: 2 weeks for first 10 year service; 3 weeks, 11-20 years; 4 weeks, 21st year thereafter.	s of
School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries	
	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,160) = 1.00 for school and cer-	in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries  Effective September 1, 1968, recognition of the M.A., 30 and the Doctorate was eliminated for all administrative except subject matter consultants and department head	ator
District ST. LOUIS,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,160) = 1.00	in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries  Effective September 1, 1968, recognition of the M.A., 30 and the Doctorate was eliminated for all administrative accept subject matter consultants and department head Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Ra	ator Is. Itio
District ST. LOUIS,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,160) = 1.00 for school and certain central administration positions.	in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries  Effective September 1, 1968, recognition of the M.A., 30 and the Doctorate was eliminated for all administrative except subject matter consultants and department head Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Ra Position (School year = 187 days) App	ator Is. tio
District ST. LOUIS,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,160) = 1.00 for school and certain central administration positions.  Flat rate, set annually,	in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries  Effective September 1, 1968, recognition of the M.A., 30 and the Doctorate was eliminated for all administrative except subject matter consultants and department head Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Ra Position (School year = 187 days) App Principals:	ator Is. tio
District ST. LOUIS,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,160) = 1.00 for school and certain central administration positions.	in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries  Effective September 1, 1968, recognition of the M.A., 30 and the Doctorate was eliminated for all administrative except subject matter consultants and department head Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Ra Position (School year = 187 days) App Principals:  Elementary—less than 14 teachers 10½ months 1.	ator is. tio lyin
District ST. LOUIS,	Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules  Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum (\$11,160) = 1.00 for school and certain central administration positions.  Flat rate, set annually, and not based on a	Effective September 1, 1968, recognition of the M.A., 30 and the Doctorate was eliminated for all administrative except subject matter consultants and department head Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year Ra Position (School year = 187 days) App  Principals: Elementary—less than 14 teachers 10½ months 1.  14 or more teachers 10½ months 1.	atorils.



School	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salery Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Saleri	mt es
T. LOUIS,		Supervisory/ Administrative Position (School year = 187 days)	Arbitrary Ratio Applied
ontinued	,	Subject Matter Consultants and	
	For the 1969-70 school	Department Heads 10 months	
<b>*</b> *	year, expect to extend	M.A	
	the flat rate method	M.A. + 3	
	to all certificated	. Doc	
	positions above the	Coordinators	1.10
	rank of principal.	High School Administrative Assistants 10 months.	1.10 is 1.20
•		Supervising Teachers 10½ month	s 1.20
	Teachers' Schedule	Consultants	1.53
	1968-69:	Assistant Directors	1.67
		Directors 12 months.	1.07
	A.B.—\$6200-\$10,540 M.A.—\$6820-\$11,160 Doc.—\$8680-\$13,020	A flat annual rate, not geared to the teachers' I mum, is as follows for the following positions. The salary for the Supervisor of Program Development training used as the base of 1.00.	he \$14,700 int is arbi-
		•	Arbitrary
			Ratio
		Position Work Year	Applying
à.		Supervisor—Program Development 12 months.	1.00
•		Director-Work Study Program 12 months.	1.02
		Director—Teacher Recruitment 12 months.	1.02
		Director—Computer Applications 12 months	1.20
		Assistant Director—Personnel 12 months	1.22
		Assistant to Superintendent 12 months	1.22
		Directors of Fiscal Planning &	
		Control, Community Relations,	1.27
		Federal Relations	
	Relationship between	Dijetul - i sissinei - i i	
School District	Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Accin Setting Supervisory/Administrative Sala	ries
SAN FRANCISCO,	Index ratio based on	Supervisory/	Ratio Applying
CALIFORNIA	teachers' top maximum	Administrative Work Year	
	(\$13,640) = 1.00.	Position (School year = 180 days)	Min. Max
-		Principals:	6
	Teachers' Schedule	Elementary	.09 1.38
	1968·69NEA:	Junior High, Senior High, Adult 197 days 1 Assistant Principals:	.25 1.54
			.00 1.13
	A.B.—\$6820-\$11.695		.09 1.30
	******	Juliot High Collin might them the present	.03 1.00
	A.B.—\$6820-\$11,695 M.A.—\$7760-\$12,680 6 Yrs.—\$8360-\$13,640	(Includes duties usually performed by	.03 1.50
	M.A.—\$7760-\$12,680	(Includes duties usually performed by dean of boys and dean of girls)	
	M.A.—\$7760-\$12,680	(Includes duties usually performed by dean of boys and dean of girls)  Coordinator A	.57 1.88
	M.A.—\$7760-\$12,680	(Includes duties usually performed by dean of boys and dean of girls)  Coordinator A	.57 1.88 .44 1.68
	M.A.—\$7760-\$12,680	(Includes duties usually performed by dean of boys and dean of girls)  Coordinator A	.57 1.88 .44 1.68 .09 1.38
	M.A.—\$7760-\$12,680	(Includes duties usually performed by dean of boys and dean of girls)   Coordinator A	.57 1.88 .44 1.68



ERIC Full Task Provided by ERIC

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salery Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Access in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Selario	
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA	Independent of teachers' schedule. Teachers' Schedule 1962-69:	The maximum salary for elementary school (\$17,747) is arbitrarily used as a ratio basis of Master's degree is required for all supervisory an istrative positions.	1.00. A
	A.B.—\$6510-\$8910	Supervisory/	Arbitrary
	M.A.—\$7710-\$11,600	Administrative Work Year	Ratio
	Dec.—\$14,130	Position (School year = 180 days)	Applying
		Principals:	
		Elementary 210 days	1.00
		Junior High 213 days 213 days	
		Senier High 230 days	1.18
		Vice Principals:	
		Elementary Not given	
		Junior High Not given	
		Senier High Not given	
		Coordinator I Not given	
		Coordinator    Not given Not given Not given	
		Supervisor    Not given	
		Assistant Director—Voc. Center Net given	
		Director—Vecational Center Not given	
		Directors Not given	
		Administrative Assistant Net given	1.12

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Indusin's- tration and Teacher Solary Schedules	Censiderations and Factors Takon into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
SEATTLE, WACKINGTON	Independent of teachers' schedule.	Persons appointed to supervisory and administrative positions must have a B.A. plus 90 querter hours plus M.A. training; \$600 is added for an approved doctorate.
	Teathers' Schedule	•
	1968-69:	Salaries set by a Classification and Review Board after de- tailed study of job descriptions, amount of work and/or
	A.B.—\$6175-\$6975	responsibility, accountability, and other factors, including
	M.A.—\$6775-\$9855 Dec.—\$7700-\$12,250	the number of days required for a particular position.
		For comparative purposes, the maximum salary for elementary school principals (\$15,250) is arbitrarily used as a base ratio of 1.00.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schodules	Adminis- Teacher Considerations and Factors Taken into Account						
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON		Supervisory/	Arbit	trary R	atios A Work	pplying Years	for T	hese
continued		Administrative	183	192	202	217	222	227,
		Position	Days	Days	Days	Days	Days	Days'
				(Sch	nel weer	= 183	(cyeb)	
		Principals:		(0000	,			
		Elementary		_	1.00	_	_	_
		Junior High		_	1.06	_	_	_
		Senior High		_	1.10	_	_	
		Vice Principals:						
		Elementary	—	_	0.87	_	_	_
		Junior High	—	_	0.91	_	_	_
		Senior High		_	0.94	_	_	_
		Administrative						
		Assistants:						
		Salary Class 2				0.94		0.98
		Salary Class 3		0.86		0.97		1.02
		Salary Class 4		0.89			1.03	1.05
		Salary Class 5	—	0.92	0.97	1.04	1.06	1.09
		Coordinators:						
		Salary Class 5		0. <del>9</del> 2				1.09
		Salary Class 6		_	1.00	1.07	1.10	1.12
		Directors:					1 10	1 10
		Salary Class 6		_	1.00		1.10	1.12 1.19
		Salary Class 7		_	1.06		1.16	1.19
		Salary Class, 8		_	1.10	1.18	1.21	1.23
		Salary Class 9		_	_	_	1.25 1.29	1.32
		Salary Class 10			_=		1.29	1.32

School District	Relationship between Supervivory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salery Schodules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
TUCSON, ARIZONA	Ratio based on what administrator would earn as a teacher with	Supervisory/ Administrative Work Yeer Ratio Position (School yeer = 185 days)  Applying
	comparable preparation and experience.	Principals:         10 months         1.35           Junior High         10 months         1.40
	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:	High School
	A.B.—\$5900-\$3234 M.A.—\$6343-\$11,181	Junior High       10 months       1.30         Senior High       12 months       1.40         Deans       9½ months       1.20         Coordinators       10 months       1.30
	Doc.—\$7021-\$12,0 <del>9</del> 5	Coordinators         10 months         1.30           Directors         12 months         1.45           Supervisors         10 months         1.35

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminiz- trative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factor in Sotting Supervisory/A			
TULSA, OKLAHOMA	Index ratio based on teachers' A.B., mini-				tio
	mem (\$5400) = 1.00.	Supervisory/ Administrative Work You			lying M.A.
		Administrative Work TO Position (School year =	_		
	Teachers' Schedule		10~ (Mys)	Min.	Max.
	1 <b>968-69</b> :	Principals:	01/	~ ==	
		ElementaryTeaching Units:	9½ months	1.85	2.18
	A.B.—\$5400-\$7992	29 or less	10	1.05	2 21
	M.A.—\$5832-\$8856	34		1.95 1.97	2.31
	Dec.—\$6912-\$10,368	39		1.99	2.33 2.35
		44			2.33
		49			2.39
		54 or more		2.05	2.39
		Senior High 49 or less	12 months	2.00	2.71
			inc. vecation	2.20	2.62
		54			2.64
		59		2.24	2.66
		64		2.26	2.68
		<b>69</b>			2.70
		74			2.72
		79 er more		2.32	2.74
		Assistant Principals:-based on			
		Elementary	9 months	1.42	1.93
		Junier High	9½ months	1.61	2.15
		Senior High		1.68	2.21
		Coordinators—Instruction		1.70	2.03
		Supervisers—Instruction			
		Lowest grouping		1.70	2.03
		Highest grouping	*	1.80	2.13
		Directors—Instruction:			
		Lowest grouping		1.90	2.26
		Highest grouping	12 months	2.00	2.36
		Supervisors—Special Services:			
		Lowest grouping		1.50	1.82
		Middle grouping		1.70	2.03
		Highest grouping	12 months	1.80	2.13
		Assistant Directors—			
		Special Services	MOC GIVEN	1.62	1.96
		Directors—Special Services;	<b></b>		
		Lowest grouping		1.70	
		2nd grouping		1.90	2.26
		3rd grouping		2.00	2.36
		Highest grouping		2.10	2.50 2.74
		Directors—Supt. Staff:		2.30	2.14
		Several grouping	Met since	2.40	2.86
		Middle grouping		2.50	2.96 2.98
		Highest grouping		2.60	3.08
		Wage and Salary Analyst		2.30	2.74
		—cesting		2.30	2.17

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Salary Schodules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
TULSA, OKLAHOMA— continued		Supervisory/ Administrative Work Year for M.A.  Position (School yeer = 184 days) Min. Max.  Directors—Business Services: Lowest grouping
		Supplemental ratios added as follows for higher preparation 0.08 for M.A. plus 30 approved hours; 0.08 for M.A. plu 60 approved hours; 0.12 for an earned dectorate.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Adminis- trative and Teacher Selary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken Into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salarie	
WASHINGTON, D. C.	Index plan with teachers' M.A. meximu:a (\$11,550) = 1.00.	Supervisory/ Administrative Work Yeer Position (School yeer = 184 days)	Ratio Applying
	Congress makes decisions as to what salary schedules shell be 1968-69 salaries represented a 17% increase over 1967-68.	Principals: All 218 days  Level I	1.52 1.56 1.60
	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:	Assistant Principels	r
	A.B.—\$7000-\$10,850 M.A.—\$7700-\$11,550 Doc.—\$8400-\$12,250	Supervising Directors Not given  Directors Not given  Group 5 Group 6 Group 7	. 1. <b>6</b> 5
		The above ratios are all based on M.A. maximum positions listed. \$350 (0.03 ratio) is added M.A. + 30 credit hours; another \$350 for a doctorate.	l for a

